arXiv:math-ph/0605050v1 17 May 2006

APPLICATION OF APPROXIMATION THEORY BY NONLINEAR MANIFOLDS IN STURM-LIOUVILLE INVERSE PROBLEMS

AMADEO IRIGOYEN

Abstract. We give here some negative results in Sturm-Liouville inverse theory, meaning that we cannot approach any of the potentials with $m+1$ integrable derivatives on $\mathbb{R}^+$ by an ω-parametric analytic family better than order of $(\omega \ln \omega)^{-(m+1)}$.

Next, we prove an estimation of the eigenvalues and characteristic values of a Sturm-Liouville operator and some properties of the solution of a certain integral equation. This allows us to deduce from [5] some positive results about the best reconstruction formula by giving an almost optimal formula of order of ω^{-m}.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Some results on approximation theory by nonlinear manifolds 4
3. An estimation of the eigenvalues and characteristic values 12
4. Some properties of the solution of a certain integral equation 21
5. Applications in Sturm-Liouville inverse problems 31
References 39

1. Introduction

In this paper we deal with one of the problems of Sturm-Liouville inverse theory. We consider the equation on the half-axis $\mathbb{R}^+$

$$-\frac{d^2y}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q y = \lambda y \,,$$

where the potential $-\omega^2 Q$ is strictly negative with many derivatives which are locally integrable and polynomially decreasing at infinity, and ω a large enough parameter. We know (see [1]) that the operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$ admits $N(\omega)$ (of order ω) negative eigenvalues $-\xi_j^2$ and for each one of these an unique eigenfunction ϕ_j such that

$$\phi_j(0) = 0 \text{ and } \int_0^\infty |\phi_j(x)|^2 dx = 1 \,.$$

We put $C_j = (\phi_j'(0))^2$, which is called the characteristic value associated to ξ_j.

The problem deals with the reconstruction of the potential $-\omega^2 Q$ from given data of the eigenfunctions, and more precisely from the eigenvalues ξ_j and characteristic values C_j. The motivation comes from one side, of the questions of seismology (see [5], [6]), and on the other side from the results of Lax and Levermore on the small dispersion limit of the KdV equation (see [8]). We know that there are more or less explicit approximation formulas coming from the works of Gelfand, Levitan, Kohn and Jost (see [4], [9]). Moreover, motivated by Lax and Levermore, G. Henkin and N. Novikova gave in [5] some results with more precision on the convergence : more precisely, they gave formulas that approximate any Q with $m+1$ locally integrable derivatives uniformly on any $[0, X]$ when $\omega \to +\infty$, at least at order $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$.

Then there is a natural question (see [5], p. 22) about a better approximation : is there another formula (and can it in this case be made explicit) which gives a faster convergence to Q ?

There are two cases in which we give an answer : in the first with $m = 1$ there is an explicit approximation formula of Gelfand-Levitan type :

$$Q_\omega^0(x) = \frac{2}{\omega^2}\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\ln|\det(W_{s,r})(x)|,$$

with

$$W_{s,r}(x) = \frac{2sh(\xi_r+\xi_s)x}{\xi_r+\xi_s} - (1-\delta_{s,r})\frac{2sh(\xi_r-\xi_s)x}{\xi_r-\xi_s} - \delta_{s,r}\left(2x - \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\right).$$

This formula (see [5]) approximates any Q by primitives uniformly on any $[0, X]$, with order $\frac{\ln\omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}$ (but hopefully the precision could be better, like $\frac{1}{\omega^3}$). We then have the following result :

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{Q}_2$ be the class of functions Q, defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$, strictly positive, polynomially decreasing with 2 locally integrable derivatives such that $Q'(0) = 0$, and with operators $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$. For all $N = O(\omega)$, let $\psi(x,\zeta)$ be a function which is defined on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^N$, of class C^1 with respect to x and entire of exponential type with respect to $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^N$. Then the approximation of*

$$\int_0^{\cdot} \mathcal{Q}_2 := \left\{\left(x \mapsto \int_0^x Q(t)dt\right),\ Q \in \mathcal{Q}_2\right\}$$

uniformly on any $[0, X]$, by the family

$$\left\{\left(x \mapsto \left(\frac{1}{\psi}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}\right)(x,\zeta)\right),\ \zeta_j = O(\omega^r),\ \forall\, j = 1,\dots,N\right\},$$

when $\omega \to \infty$, cannot be better than order of

$$\frac{1}{(\omega\ln\omega)^3}.$$

Moreover there is a case where the approximation is (at least) of order of $\frac{\ln\omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}$, which is given by the formula of Gelfand-Levitan type :

$$\Psi(x,\zeta) = \det \widetilde{W}_{s,r}(x,\zeta),$$

with

$$\widetilde{W}_{s,r}(x,\zeta) = \frac{2sh(\zeta_r+\zeta_s)x}{\zeta_r+\zeta_s} - (1-\delta_{s,r})\frac{2sh(\zeta_s-\zeta_r)x}{\zeta_s-\zeta_r} - \delta_{s,r}\left(2x - \exp\left(\zeta_{r+N(\omega)}\right)\right),$$

s, $r = 1,\dots,N(\omega)$, where $N(\omega)$ is the number of eigenvalues ξ_j and characteristic values C_j of the operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$, whose optimizing element can be chosen to

be

$$\zeta_j(Q) = \xi_j(Q) \text{ and } \zeta_{j+N(\omega)}(Q) = \ln \frac{4\xi_j^2(Q)}{C_j(Q)},\ j = 1, \dots, N(\omega).$$

This result will be proved in section 5 : the Gelfand-Levitan type formula can indeed be seen as a nonlinear family with respect to the parameters ξ_j and C_j. In general one approximation formula can be considered as an approximation of any compact subset of $\mathcal{Q}_2$ by a nonlinear manifold. More precisely we deal with the case when the family is represented by an entire function of exponential type. Thanks to the negative results on approximation theory (which will be given in section 2, see [7]), we will be able to get lower bounds for such approximation formulas. Notice (see section 2) that the decreasing condition of any Q is not usefull to prove the negative case. However an estimation of the eigenvalues and characteristic values (which will be proved on section 3) is necessary :

Proposition 1.1. *Let $-\omega^2 Q$ be a strictly negative and integrable potential of class C^1 with $Q'(0) = 0$, and that is polynomially decreasing. Then for any sufficiently large ω and $j = 1, \dots, N(\omega)$, one has*

$$\frac{1}{a\omega^b} \leq \xi_j \leq a\omega^b \text{ and } \frac{1}{\alpha \exp\left(\beta\omega^\gamma\right)} \leq \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j} \leq \alpha \exp\left(\beta\omega^\gamma\right).$$

This decreasing condition of Q is assumed in order to apply rigorously the WKB method but apparently it should still be true in a more general case (see [8], III).

In order to get a better estimation, not only for 2 derivatives but for $m+1$ derivatives (see [5]), we have to deal with not explicit formulas (because any better estimate is not achieved by this explicit formula given above) which approximate Q with order (at least) of $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$ (we think that the precision could be better, of order of $\frac{1}{\omega^{m+1}}$). However these formulas have, in the case where the derivatives of Q vanish at 0, the following expression :

$$Q_\omega(x) = \frac{2}{\omega^2}\left(-\frac{d}{dx}A(x,x) + \frac{d^2}{dx^2}\det T_{j,k}(x)\right),$$

where $A(x,y)$ is the solution of the integral equation

$$A(x,y) + \int_0^x A(x,s)\Phi(s,y)ds + \Phi(x,y) = 0$$

with

$$\Phi(x,y) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin kx}{k}\frac{\sin ky}{k}\left(\sqrt{k^2+\omega^2 Q(0)} - k\right)\frac{2k}{\pi}dk,$$

and for all $j,k = 1, \dots, N(\omega)$

$$\begin{aligned} T_{j,k}(x) &= \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\delta_{j,k} \\ &+ 4\int_0^x \left(sh(\xi_j t) + \int_0^t A(t,s)sh(\xi_j s)ds\right)\left(sh(\xi_k t) + \int_0^t A(t,s)sh(\xi_k s)ds\right)dt\,. \end{aligned}$$

Even better, these formulas can be seen as analytic families with respect to the parameters $\xi(Q) = \left(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{N(\omega)}\right)$, $C(Q) = \left(C_1, \dots, C_{N(\omega)}\right)$ and $\omega^2 Q(0)$. Another application of our negative results (and a positive result given in [5]) gives the following theorem :

Theorem 1.2. *Consider* $\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}$ *the class of strictly positive functions* Q*, strictly decreasing with* $m+1$ *locally integrable derivatives which vanish at* 0*, and their Sturm-Liouville operators* $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}-\omega^2 Q$*. For any* $N, M = O(\omega)$*, let* $\psi(x,\zeta,w)$ *(resp.* $k(x,\zeta,w)$ *) be a function defined on* $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{C}^N\times\{\Re e\, z>0\}^M$*, of class* C^2 *(resp. continuous) with respect to* $x\in\mathbb{R}^+$ *and holomorphic with exponential kind with respect to* $(\zeta,w)\in\mathbb{C}^N\times\{\Re e\, z>0\}^M$*.*

Then the approximation of $\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}$ *uniformly on any* $[0,X]$ *by the family*

$$\left\{\left(x\mapsto k(x,\zeta,w)+\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{1}{\psi}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}\right)(x,\zeta,w)\right),\ \zeta_j=O(\omega^r),\ |w_i-\omega^{r_i}|<\omega^{r_i}\right\},$$

when $\omega\to\infty$*, cannot be better than of order of*

$$\frac{1}{(\omega\ln\omega)^{m+1}}.$$

In addition there is an almost optimal approximation formula defined as

$$k(x,w)=-\frac{\partial}{\partial x}A(x,x,w)\ \text{ and }\ \Psi(x,\zeta,w)=\det T_{j,k}(x,\zeta,w)$$

for $(\zeta,w)\in\mathbb{C}^{2N(\omega)}\times\{\Re e\, z>0\}$*, which gives a positive result of order of*

$$\frac{1}{\omega^m}.$$

Moreover $Q\in\mathcal{Q}$ *being given, such an element* $(\zeta(Q),w(Q))$ *can be chosen as*

$$\zeta_j(Q)=\xi_j(Q),\ \zeta_{j+N(\omega)}(Q)=\ln\frac{4\xi_j^2(Q)}{C_j(Q)},\ j=1,\ldots,N(\omega),\ \text{ and }\ w(Q)=\omega^2 Q(0).$$

As in the previous case, the decreasing condition is not usefull to prove the negative case. However, in order to associate negative and positive results we must prove some properties of the solution $A(x,y)$ (see section 4) :

Proposition 1.2. *The solution* $A\left(x,y,\omega^2 Q(0)\right)$ *exists and is unique, and can be holomorphically extended by* $A(x,y,w)$ *on the half-plane* $W=\{\Re e\, w>0\}$ *with the following properties :*

$$x\in\mathbb{R}^+\mapsto A(x,y,w)\in L^2_y([0,x]),$$

is continuously differentiable and of polynomial kind with respect to $w\in W$*.*

We finish then by giving some examples of inverse problems with some possible analogous applications.

I would like to thank G. Henkin for interesting problems and improving discussions about this work.

2. Some results on approximation theory by nonlinear manifolds

We consider the compact set $\Lambda_l(I^s),\ I=[0,1],\ s\in\mathbb{N}^*,\ l>0,$

$$\Lambda_{l,s}=\Lambda_l(I^s)=\left\{f\in C^l(I^s),\ \forall j,\ 0\le j\le m,\ \left\|f^{(j)}\right\|_\infty\le 1,\ \left\|f^{(m)}\right\|_\infty\le 1\right\},$$

where $l=m+\alpha,\ m\in\mathbb{N},\ 0<\alpha\le 1$ $(m=-[l]-1)$, and

$$\|f\|_\alpha=\sup_{x\neq y}\frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{\|x-y\|^\alpha},$$

with $\|\cdot\|$ the usual euclidian norm ($\Lambda_{l,s}$ is a compact subset of $\big(C^0(I^s), \|\cdot\|_\infty\big)$ and $\big(L^1(I^s), \|\cdot\|_1\big)$).

We remind the theorem of Vitushkin (see [11], [12]) :

Theorem 2.1. *Let consider the family*

$$P_{n,d} = \left\{ P(\zeta) = \sum_{|k|\le d} c_k(x)\zeta^k,\ \zeta = (\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \right\},$$

where $n \ge 1,\ d \ge 2$ are integers, and $c_k \in C(I^s)$ (resp. $L^1(I^s)$).

Then $\exists\, h \in \Lambda_{l,s}$, such that $\forall\, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\|h - P(\zeta)\| \ge \frac{C(l,s)}{(n\log d)^{\frac{l}{s}}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ (resp. $\|\cdot\|_{L^1}$), $C(l,s) = C_\infty(l,s)$ (resp. $C_{L^1}(l,s)$).

Equivalently, if $\mathcal{P}_{n,d}$ is the set of families of $C(I^s)$ (resp. $L^1(I^s)$) which are parametrized by n variables and polynomially of degree (at most) d, then

$$D_{n,d}(\Lambda_{l,s}) := \inf_{P\in\mathcal{P}_{n,d}} \sup_{h\in\Lambda_{l,s}} \inf_{\zeta\in\mathbb{R}^n} \|h - P(\zeta)\| \ge \frac{C(l,s)}{(n\log d)^{\frac{l}{s}}}.$$

The complete proof of this theorem with precision of constants is given in [7] *:*

$$C_\infty(l,s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}\,2^{l+1}8^{\frac{l}{s}}([l]+1)^{[l]+1}(4(1+e))^{s([l]+1)}},$$

and

$$C_{L^1}(l,s) = \frac{(([l]+1)!)^{2s}}{5\sqrt{s}\,2^{l+2}18^{\frac{l}{s}}([l]+1)^{[l]+1}((2[l]+3)!)^s(1+e)^{s([l]+1)}}.$$

Remark 2.1. In the continuous case when $s = 1$ and $l > 1$, we can even assume that $h \in \Lambda_l \cap C^l(I^s)$ and satisfies (see corollary 3 in [7]) :

$$(*)\begin{cases} \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{(n\log d)^{\frac{l}{s}}} \le \|h\|_\infty = |h(x(\zeta))| \le \frac{2^l C_\infty(l,1)}{(n\log d)^{\frac{l}{s}}}, \\ h(x(\zeta),\zeta)P(x(\zeta),\zeta) \le 0 \\ h(x) = 0,\ \forall\, x \in \left[0, \frac{1}{20}\right]. \end{cases}$$

We remind the following theorem as well (the proof is given in [7]), which is an analogous result of the theorem 2.1 for the analytic case :

Theorem 2.2. *Let consider the domain $W = \{\Re e\, z > 0\}$ and for $N \ge 2,\ M \ge 0$,*

$$f(x,\zeta,w) = f(x_1,\ldots,x_s,\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_N,w_1,\ldots,w_M),\ x \in I^s,\ \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N,\ w \in \left(\mathbb{R}^+\right)^M$$

where f is entire with respect to $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^N$, holomorphic with respect to $w \in W^M$ and continuous with respect to $x \in I^s$. Assume that $\forall\, (\zeta, w) \in \mathbb{C}^N \times W^M$,

$$\|f(\cdot,\zeta,w)\|_\infty \le Ae^{u(N+M)^v}e^{b(N+M)^t\left(\|\zeta\|_1^d + \|w\|_1^d\right)},$$

where $A, u, v, b, t, d \in [1, +\infty[$ and $\|\zeta\|_1 = |\zeta_1| + \ldots + |\zeta_N|$ (as well as $\|w\|_1$).

Consider the subset

$$\Omega_{N,M} = \left\{(\zeta,w) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \left(\mathbb{R}^+\right)^M,\ |\zeta_j| \le B_1(M+N)^{r_1},\ |w_i - a_i| \le (1-\varepsilon)a_i\right\},$$

where for all i, $a_i \leq B_2(M+N)^{r_2}$, and B_1, B_2, r_1, $r_2 \geq 1$ and $0<\varepsilon<1$.

Then $\exists\, h \in \Lambda_{l,s}$ such that $\forall\,(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}$

$$\|h-f(\cdot,\zeta,w)\|_\infty \geq \frac{C}{\Big((M+N)\log_{[2]}(M+N)\Big)^{\frac{l}{s}}}\,.$$

In the case $s=1$ and $l>1$, we can in addition assume that h is identically zero in $\left[0,\frac{1}{20}\right]$ (property $(*)$) and satisfies that $\forall\,(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}$, $\exists\, x_{\zeta,w}$ such that

$$(*')\begin{cases}\frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{((N+M)\log(K+K^2))^l} \leq |h(x_{\zeta,w})| \leq \|h\|_\infty \leq \frac{2^l C_\infty(l,1)}{((N+M)\log(K+K^2))^l},\\ h(x_{\zeta,w})P_K(x_{\zeta,w},\zeta,w)\leq 0,\\ \|R_K(\cdot,\zeta,w)\|_\infty \leq \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M)\log(K+K^2))^l}\,,\end{cases}$$

where $f(\cdot,\zeta,w)=P_K(\cdot,\zeta,w)+R_K(\cdot,\zeta,w)$ is the decomposition of f as a polynomial P_K and the remainder R_K, with $K=O\left((N+M)^\alpha\right)$.

Although it seems to be unnatural, the choice of the half-plane W is motived by the applications in the last section (see theorem 5.2) where we will choose $M=1$. We deduce here the following corollaries from theorem 2.2, which will be usefull in the section 5.

Corollary 2.1. *Let $\psi(x,\zeta,w)$ be a function, defined on $[0,1]\times\mathbb{C}^N\times W^M$, of class C^2 with respect to x, such that for all $x\in[0,1]$ the functions $\psi(x,\zeta,w)$, $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}(x,\zeta,w)$ and $\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial x^2}(x,\zeta,w)$ satisfy the conditions of theorem 2.2. Let be in the other side $k(x,\zeta,w)$ continue with respect to x and analytic of exponential type with respect to (ζ,w) such that the restriction on $\mathbb{R}^N\times\left(\mathbb{R}^+\right)^M$ is of polynomial type.*

Moreover assume that $\forall\,(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}$

$$\frac{1}{\psi(0,\zeta,w)} = O\left(e^{\alpha(M+N)^\beta}\right)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}(0,\zeta,w)=0.$$

Let finally $b_{M,N}>0$ be a constant such that $b_{M,N}$ and $\frac{1}{b_{M,N}}$ are of polynomial type at $M+N$.

Then the approximation of $\Lambda_l([0,1])$ by the family

$$\left\{\left(x\in[0,1]\mapsto\frac{1}{b_{M,N}}\left(k(x,\zeta,w)+\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{1}{\psi}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}\right)(x,\zeta,w)\right)\right),\,(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}\right\},$$

in the uniform sense on $[0,1]$, when $N+M\to+\infty$, cannot be better than

$$\frac{\widetilde{C}}{(N+M)^l(\ln(N+M))^l}.$$

In addition, a function h which satisfies the minoration can be choosen in $\Lambda_l\cap C^{[l]}([0,1])$ and be identically zero on $\left[0,\frac{1}{20}\right]$.

Proof. We can assume that $\forall\,(\zeta,w),\ \psi(0,\zeta,w)>0$: indeed, the condition about $\psi(0,\zeta,w)$ shows that it nevers vanishes on the (connected) set $\mathbb{R}^N\times(\mathbb{R}^+)^m$, then has the same sign and can be replaced by $-\psi$ (this does not change the family).

Let ψ, k be given and set

$$\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)=e^{\widetilde{k}(x,\zeta,w)}\psi(x,\zeta,w)\,,$$

with $\widetilde{k}(x,\zeta,w)=\int_0^x dt\int_0^t k(s,\zeta,w)ds$. First we claim that the theorem 2.2 is still true with $\widetilde{\psi}$ (although it can be not of exponential type) : there is indeed

$$\left\|e^{\widetilde{k}(\cdot,\zeta,w)}\right\|_\infty\leq\widetilde{A}e^{\widetilde{\alpha}(N+M)^{\widetilde{\beta}}},$$

then by applying the theorem 2.2 to $\widetilde{A}e^{\widetilde{\alpha}(N+M)^{\widetilde{\beta}}}\psi$ we get by property $(*')$ with $K=O(N+M)$ and for all $(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}$:

$$\widetilde{A}e^{\widetilde{\alpha}(N+M)^{\widetilde{\beta}}}\psi(x,\zeta,w)=P_K(x,\zeta,w)+R_K(x,\zeta,w)$$

and

$$\left\|\frac{e^{\widetilde{k}(\cdot,\zeta,w)}}{\widetilde{A}e^{\widetilde{\alpha}(N+M)^{\widetilde{\beta}}}}R_K(\cdot,\zeta,w)\right\|_\infty\leq\frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M)\log(K+K^2))^l}\,.$$

On the other side there is $h\in\Lambda_l([0,1])$ associate to the polynomial P_K, such that $\forall\,(\zeta,w),\ \exists\,x_{\zeta,w}$ wich satisfies

$$\frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{((N+M)\log(K+K^2))^l}\leq|h(x_{\zeta,w})|\ \text{ and }h(x_{\zeta,w})P_K(x_{\zeta,w},\zeta,w)\leq0,$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|h-\widetilde{\psi}(\cdot,\zeta,w)\right\|_\infty &\geq \left|h(x_{\zeta,w})-\frac{e^{\widetilde{k}(x_{\zeta,w},\zeta,w)}}{\widetilde{A}e^{\widetilde{\alpha}(N+M)^{\widetilde{\beta}}}}P_K(x_{\zeta,w},\zeta,w)\right|-\left\|\frac{e^{\widetilde{k}(\cdot,\zeta,w)}}{\widetilde{A}e^{\widetilde{\alpha}(N+M)^{\widetilde{\beta}}}}R_K(\cdot,\zeta,w)\right\|_\infty\\ &\geq \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M)\log(K+K^2))^l}\,,\end{aligned}$$

and K being polynomial at $(N+M)$, this proves theorem 2.2 with $\widetilde{\psi}$.

Now we can prove the corollary. Set

$$\widetilde{\chi}(x,\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_N,\zeta_{N+1},w)=e^{\zeta_{N+1}}\left(\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial^2x}\widetilde{\psi}-\left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial x}\right)^2\right)(x,\zeta,w)\,,$$

and we see that

$$\widetilde{\chi}(\cdot,\zeta,w)=e^{2\widetilde{k}(\cdot,\zeta,w)}\chi(\cdot,\zeta,w).$$

where χ still fulfills the conditions of theorem 2.2. It follows from above that there is $h\in\Lambda_l([0,1])$, such that for all $(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}$, $\exists\,x=x_{\zeta,\zeta_{N+1},w}$ which satisfies :

$$\begin{cases}\frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l}\leq|h(x)|\leq\|h\|_\infty\leq\frac{2^lC_\infty(l,1)}{((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l},\\ h(x)e^{2\widetilde{k}(x,\zeta,w)}P_K(x,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1},w)\leq0,\\ \left\|e^{2\widetilde{k}(\cdot,\zeta,w)}R_K(\cdot,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1},w)\right\|_\infty\leq\frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l}\,,\end{cases}$$

where $\chi=P_K+R_K$ and $K=O((N+M)^\gamma)$.

Moreover $h\in C^{[l]}([0,1])$ and is identically zero on $\left[0,\frac{1}{20}\right]$.

Next there is still for all $\mu \in [0,1]$,

$$h(x)\,\mu\, e^{2\widetilde{k}(x,\zeta,w)}P_K(x,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1},w) \le 0$$

and

$$\left\|\mu\, e^{2\widetilde{k}(\cdot,\zeta,w)}R_K(\cdot,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1},w)\right\|_\infty \le \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l},$$

then

$$|h(x)-\mu\widetilde{\chi}(x,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1},w)| \ge \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l}\,.$$

Now ψ is of exponential type (and $\widetilde{k}(0,\zeta,w)=0$) then for all $(\zeta,w)\in\Omega_{N,M}$,

$$0<\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)=\psi(0,\zeta,w)=O\left(e^{\alpha'(N+M)^{\beta'}}\right),$$

as well for $\frac{1}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}$ and $e^{b_{N,M}}$ from hypothesis, hence

$$\ln\left(\frac{e^{b_{N,M}}}{b_{N,M}\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)^2}\right)=O\left((N+M)^{r'}\right),$$

which can be chosen as value for the parameter ζ_{N+1} ; there is for all $\mu\in[0,1]$:

$$\left|h(x)-\frac{\mu e^{b_{N,M}}}{b_{N,M}}\frac{\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial^2 x}(x,\zeta,w)\,\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)-\left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial x}\right)^2(x,\zeta,w)}{\left(\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)\right)^2}\right| \ge \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l}.$$

Now assume that $e^{-b_{N,M}}\left(\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}\right)^2 \le 1$. Then it can be substituted in the inequality as value for μ to get :

$$\begin{aligned}\left|h(x)-\frac{1}{b_{N,M}}\frac{\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial^2 x}(x,\zeta,w)\,\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)-\left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial x}\right)^2(x,\zeta,w)}{\left(\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)\right)^2}\right| \quad &\ge \quad \frac{C_\infty(l,1)}{2((N+M+1)\log(K+K^2))^l}\\ &\ge \quad \frac{\widetilde{C}}{((N+M)\log(N+M))^l}\,.\end{aligned}$$

On the other case one has $\left|\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}\right| < e^{-\frac{b_{N,M}}{2}}$. After moving x closer to 0 if necessary we can assume that the function $t\mapsto\widetilde{\psi}(t,\zeta,w)$ does not vanish on $[0,x]$: if it si not the case one can consider x_0 as the first zero (>0) of $\widetilde{\psi}(\cdot,\zeta,w)$. Since $\lim_{t\to x_0^-}\widetilde{\psi}(t,\zeta,w)=0$, there is x sufficiently close to x_0, such that

$$0<\left|\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}\right|<e^{-\frac{b_{N,M}}{2}}.$$

Moreover $\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)$ and $\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)$ have same sign, the function

$$t\in[0,x]\mapsto\ln\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(t,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)},$$

is well defined (and of class C^2). Since

$$\ln\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}<-\frac{b_{N,M}}{2},$$

there is $x_1 \in [0,x]$, such that

$$\left|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\ln\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(t,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}\right)(x_1,\zeta,w)\right| = \left|\frac{\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial t}(x_1,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(x_1,\zeta,w)}\right| > \frac{b_{N,M}}{2}.$$

Otherwise we would have

$$\left|\ln\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)}\right| = \left|\int_0^x \frac{\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial t}(t,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(t,\zeta,w)}dt\right| \leq \frac{b_{N,M}}{2},$$

which is impossible.

And since from hypothesis $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(e^{\widetilde{k}(t,\zeta,w)}\widetilde{\psi}(t,\zeta,w)\right)(0) = 0$, there is as well $x_2 \in [0,x_1]$, such that

$$\left|\frac{\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial^2 t}(x_2,\zeta,w)\widetilde{\psi}(x_2,\zeta,w) - \left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial t}\right)^2(x_2,\zeta,w)}{\left(\widetilde{\psi}(x_2,\zeta,w)\right)^2}\right| > \frac{b_{N,M}}{2}\,,$$

thus

$$\left|h(x_2) - \frac{1}{b_{N,M}}\frac{\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial^2 t}(x_2,\zeta,w)\widetilde{\psi}(x_2,\zeta,w) - \left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial t}\right)^2(x_2,\zeta,w)}{\left(\widetilde{\psi}(x_2,\zeta,w)\right)^2}\right| \geq \frac{1}{2} - \|h\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

since $2^l C_\infty(l,1) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ (see the statement of theorem 2.1). It follows that

$$\left|h(x_2) - \frac{1}{b_{N,M}}\frac{\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial^2 t}(x_2,\zeta,w)\,\widetilde{\psi}(x_2,\zeta,w) - \left(\frac{\partial\widetilde{\psi}}{\partial t}\right)^2(x_2,\zeta,w)}{\left(\widetilde{\psi}(x_2,\zeta,w)\right)^2}\right| \geq \frac{1}{4} \geq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{((N+M)\log(N+M))^l}$$

($\widetilde{C}$ is small enough), which completes the second case.

At last

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\ln\frac{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)} = k(x,\zeta,w) + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\ln\frac{\psi(x,\zeta,w)}{\psi(0,\zeta,w)}\,,$$

we can conclude that there is $h \in \Lambda_l \cap C^l([0,1])$ which is identically zero on $\left[0,\frac{1}{20}\right]$ such that for all $(\zeta,w) \in \Omega_{N,M}$,

$$\left\|h - \frac{1}{b_{N,M}}\left(k(\cdot,\zeta,w) + \frac{\frac{\partial^2\psi}{\partial^2 x}(\cdot,\zeta,w)\psi(\cdot,\zeta,w) - \left(\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}\right)^2(\cdot,\zeta,w)}{\left(\psi(\cdot,\zeta,w)\right)^2}\right)\right\|_\infty \geq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{((N+M)\ln(N+M))^l}\,.$$

√

In a more particular case there is the following corollary :

Corollary 2.2. *Consider here* $\psi(x,\zeta)$ *on* $[0,1]\times\mathbb{C}^N$, *of class* C^1 *with respect to* x *and such that* $\psi(x,\zeta)$ *and* $\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}(x,\zeta)$ *satisfy the conditions of theorem 2.2 with* $M=0$, *and*

$$\frac{1}{\psi(0,\zeta)} = O\left(e^{\alpha N^\beta}\right).$$

Then the approximation of the compact set

$$\int_0^{\cdot} \Lambda_l([0,1]) = \left\{ \left(x \mapsto \int_0^x h(t)dt \right), \ h \in \Lambda_l \right\}$$

by the family

$$\left\{ \left(x \in [0,1] \mapsto \frac{1}{b_N} \left(\frac{1}{\psi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right)(x,\zeta) \right), \zeta_j = O(N^r), \forall\, j = 1, \ldots, N \right\},$$

uniformly on $[0,1]$*, where* $b_N > 0$ *and* $\frac{1}{b_N}$ *are of polynomial kind at* N*, cannot be better than*

$$\frac{\widetilde{C}}{N^{l+1}(\ln N)^{l+1}}.$$

Moreover one can choose $h \in \Lambda_l \cap C^l(I^s)$ *identically zero on* $\left[0, \frac{1}{20}\right]$.

Proof. We can in the same way assume that $\forall\, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^N, \ \psi(0,\zeta) > 0$. Then ψ being given, let consider

$$\chi(x, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_N, \zeta_{N+1}) = e^{\zeta_{N+1}} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}(x, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_N).$$

By theorem 2.2 with $M = 0$ there is $h_1 \in \Lambda_{l+1} \cap C^{l+1}([0,1])$ identically zero on $\left[0, \frac{1}{20}\right]$ which satisfies $(*')$ with respect to χ.

Let consider $\mu \in [0,1]$, there is

$$\begin{aligned} |h_1(x) - \mu\chi(x,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1})| &\geq |h_1(x) - \mu P_K(x,\zeta)| - \mu \|R_K(\cdot,\zeta,\zeta_{N+1})\|_\infty \\ &\geq \frac{C_\infty(l+1,1)}{2((N+1)\log K)^{l+1}} \\ &\geq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{(N\log N)^{l+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Particularly one can choose $\zeta_{N+1} = \ln \frac{e^{b_N}}{b_N \psi(0,\zeta)} = O\left(N^{r'}\right)$. Now if $e^{b_N} \frac{\psi(x,\zeta)}{\psi(0,\zeta)} \geq 1$, we get by substituting $\mu = \frac{\psi(0,\zeta)}{e^{b_N}\psi(x,\zeta)}$

$$\left| h_1(x) - \frac{1}{b_N} \frac{\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}(x,\zeta)}{\psi(x,\zeta)} \right| \geq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{(N\log N)^{l+1}};$$

otherwise $\psi(x,\zeta) < \frac{\psi(0,\zeta)}{e^{b_N}}$. Thus after taking x close enough to 0 if necessary, we can assume that the function $t \mapsto \psi(t,\zeta)$ does not vanish on $[0,x]$: if it is not the case let consider x_0 to be the first zero (> 0) of $\psi(\cdot,\zeta)$. Since $\lim_{t\to x_0^-} \psi(t,\zeta) = 0$, there is an x_1 sufficiently close to x_0 such that

$$0 < \left| \frac{\psi(x_1,\zeta)}{\psi(0,\zeta)} \right| < e^{-b_N}.$$

Moreover $\psi(x_1,\zeta)$ and $\psi(0,\zeta)$ have same sign, and so the function

$$t \in [0,x_1] \mapsto \ln \frac{\psi(t,\zeta)}{\psi(0,\zeta)}$$

is well defined (and of class C^1).

Since

$$\ln \frac{\psi(x_1,\zeta)}{\psi(0,\zeta)} < -b_N,$$

there is $x_2 \in [0, x_1]$ such that

$$\left| \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \ln \frac{\psi(t,\zeta)}{\psi(0,\zeta)} \right) (x_2,\zeta) \right| = \left| \frac{\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}(x_2,\zeta)}{\psi(x_2,\zeta)} \right| > b_N \,.$$

Otherwise we would have

$$\left| \ln \frac{\psi(x_1,\zeta)}{\psi(0,\zeta)} \right| = \left| \int_0^{x_1} \frac{\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t}(t,\zeta)}{\psi(t,\zeta)} dt \right| \leq b_N,$$

which is impossible. And since $\|h_1\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we get

$$\left| h_1(x_1) - \frac{1}{b_N} \frac{\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}(x_1,\zeta)}{\psi(x_1,\zeta)} \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{(N \log N)^{l+1}} \,.$$

At last, set $h = h_1' \in \Lambda_l \cap C^l([0,1])$, then $h_1(x) = \int_0^x h(t)dt$ (since $h_1(0) = 0$) and h is identically zero on $\left[0, \frac{1}{20}\right]$ too.

$\surd$

In the section 5 we will also use the following

Corollary 2.3. *The corollaries 2.1 and 2.2 are still true (with* $l > 1$*) if we only consider in* $\Lambda_l \cap C^{[l]}([0,1])$ *the functions* $h > 0$ *which are strictly decreasing and satisfy*

$$h^{(j)}(0) = 0, \forall\, j = 1, \ldots, [l].$$

Proof. Consider ψ and set

$$\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w) = \exp\left(b_{N,M} \left(a x^{[l]+3} - d x^2 \right) \right) \psi(x,\zeta,w),$$

with a, $d > 0$. Then $\widetilde{\psi}$ still fulfills the conditions of corollariy 2.1 (resp. corollary 2.2) : indeed $b_{N,M}$ (resp. b_N) is polynomial at $N+M$ (resp. N), $\widetilde{\psi}$ is of class C^2 on $[0,1]$ (resp. C^1) and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left(\ln \frac{\widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta,w)}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)} \right) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \left(\ln \frac{\psi(x,\zeta,w)}{\psi(0,\zeta,w)} \right) + b_{N,M} \left(a([l]+3)([l]+2)x^{[l]+1} - 2d \right) \,.$$

According to the corollary 2.1 there is $h \in \Lambda_l \cap C^{[l]}([0,1])$ which satisfies : $\forall\, (\zeta, w) \in \Omega_{N,M}$, $\exists\, x \in [0,1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| h - \frac{1}{b_{N,M}} \left(k + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \ln \frac{\widetilde{\psi}}{\widetilde{\psi}(0,\zeta,w)} \right) (\cdot,\zeta,w) \right\|_\infty &= \left\| \widetilde{h} - \frac{1}{b_{N,M}} \left(k + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \ln \frac{\psi}{\psi(0,\zeta,w)} \right) (\cdot,\zeta,w) \right\|_\infty \\ &\geq \frac{\widetilde{C}}{(N \log N)^l} \,, \end{aligned}$$

with $\widetilde{h}(x) = h(x) + 2d - a([l]+3)([l]+2)x^{[l]+1}$.

In the case of corollary 2.2 we get in the same way : $\forall\, \zeta$, $\exists\, x \in [0,1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^x h(t)dt - \frac{1}{b_N \widetilde{\psi}(x,\zeta)} \frac{\partial \widetilde{\psi}}{\partial x}(x,\zeta) \right| &= \left| \int_0^x \widetilde{h}(t)dt - \frac{1}{b_N \psi(x,\zeta)} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}(x,\zeta) \right| \\ &\geq \frac{C'}{(N \log N)^{l+1}} \,. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have to choose suitably a and d : on $\left[\frac{1}{20},1\right]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{h}'(x) &= h'(x)-a([l]+3)([l]+2)([l]+1)x^{[l]}\\ &\leq -a([l]+3)([l]+2)([l]+1)\frac{1}{20^{[l]}}+\|h'\|_\infty\\ &< 0\,,\end{aligned}$$

with a sufficiently large (since $h\in\Lambda_l([0,1])$). Thus $\widetilde{h}$ is strictly decreasing, as well as on $\left[0,\frac{1}{20}\right]$ where h is a constant. a being fixed, d can be chosen sufficiently large in order to get $\widetilde{h}>0$. It follows that $\widetilde{h}$ is strictly decreasing and all its derivatives until order $[l]$ vanish at 0.

Because h is in a homothetic of $\Lambda_l([0,1])$, it is sufficient to finish the proof to consider $\frac{\widetilde{h}}{a([l]+3)([l]+2)+2d+1}$, after changing $b_{N,M}$ (resp. b_N) and reducing $\widetilde{C}$ with respect to a and d (which only depend on $[l]$).

$\surd$

3. AN ESTIMATION OF THE EIGENVALUES AND CHARACTERISTIC VALUES

We consider the equation on the half-axis $\mathbb{R}^+$

$$-y''(x)-\omega^2 Q(x)=\lambda y(x),$$

with the following hypothesis : Q is strictly positive, integrable and has $m+1$ derivatives which are polynomially decreasing at infinity, and ω is a big parameter.

For any sufficiently large ω the Sturm-Liouville operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}-\omega^2 Q$ has $N(\omega)$ discrete strictly negative eigenvalues $\lambda_j=-\xi_j^2$, $0<\xi_1<\ldots<\xi_N$, and $N(\omega)$ eigenfunctions φ_j which satisfy the condition :

$$\varphi_j(0)=0 \text{ and } \int_0^\infty|\varphi_j(x)|^2dx=1.$$

Moreover the number $N(\omega)$ has the same order as ω ; more precisely there are the bounds of Calogero (cf. [1]) :

$$\frac{\omega}{\pi\sqrt{Q(0)}}\int_0^\infty Q(x)dx-\frac{1}{2}\leq N(\omega)\leq\frac{2\omega}{\pi}\int_0^\infty\sqrt{Q(x)}dx\,.$$

It follows that for all sufficiently large ω, $a\omega\leq N(\omega)\leq b\omega$.

At last we set $C_j=\left(\varphi_j'(0)\right)^2$, the characteristic value associated to ξ_j.

To apply at section 5 the negative results from section 2, we have to prove the following estimations :

Proposition 3.1. *Let $q=-\omega^2 Q$ be a strictly negative potential where $Q>0$ is integrable of class C^1 with $Q'(0)=0$, strictly decreasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$ with polynomial behavior at infinity. Then for all sufficiently large ω and $j=1,\ldots,N(\omega)$, there are*

$$\frac{a}{\omega^b}\leq\xi_j\leq c\omega \text{ and } \frac{1}{\alpha\exp\left(\beta\omega^2\right)}\leq\frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\leq\alpha\exp\left(\beta\omega^\gamma\right),$$

where $a,b,c,\alpha,\beta,\gamma$ are constants wich only depend on Q.

Proof. This proposition is a corollary of the WKB theory which is not precisely formulated in the references, so we give a proof by using principally the WKB method like in [8]. Its consists in some following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *For all* $j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega)$,

$$\frac{a}{\omega^b} \le \xi_j \le c\omega\,.$$

Proof. Let ϕ_j be the normed eigenfunction then :

$$\begin{aligned} -\xi_j^2 = \lambda_j &= -\int_0^\infty \phi_j''(x)\phi_j(x)dx - \omega^2\int_0^\infty Q(x)\,\phi_j^2(x)dx \\ &\ge -\left[\phi_j'\phi_j\right]_0^\infty + \int_0^\infty \phi_j'^2(x)dx - \omega^2 \inf_{x\ge 0} Q(x) \\ &\ge -\omega^2 \sup_{x\ge 0} Q(x), \end{aligned}$$

then $\xi_j \le \omega \sup_{x\ge 0}\sqrt{Q(x)} = \omega\sqrt{Q(0)}$.

About the lower estimate, we have to extend the equation on the whole line $\mathbb{R}$ in order to apply the WKB method of Lax and Levermore (see [8]) : first we extend Q on an even function which still is of class C^1 (since $Q'(0) = 0$) and integrable with polynomial decreasing at infinity. Moreover the extension (which we still write Q) is monotone on $\mathbb{R}^-$, $\mathbb{R}^+$ and has the one maximum at 0.

Next we extend each eigenfunction ϕ_j on an odd function (this is possible since $\phi_j(0) = 0$) which still is of class C^2 on $\mathbb{R}$ because $\phi_j''(0) = 0$. So each extension is an eigenfunction with the same eigenvalue, and conversely we see that by restriction we get all of them (by uniqueness since the ξ_j are eigenvalues).

Now we consider the equation in the quasi-classic case :

$$-\varepsilon^2 y'' - Qy = -\eta^2 y,$$

where $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\omega}$ and $\eta_j = \frac{\xi_{N-j+1}}{\omega}$, $j = 1, \ldots, N$. Then

$$0 \le \eta_N \le \ldots \le \eta_1 \le \sqrt{Q(0)},$$

and by the WKB method

$$\Phi(\eta_j) = \left(j - \frac{1}{2}\right)\varepsilon\pi,$$

where

$$\Phi(\eta) = \int_{x_-(\eta)}^{x_+(\eta)} \left(Q(y) - \eta^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy$$

with $x_+(\eta) = -x_-(\eta) \ge 0$ satisfying $-Q(x_+(\eta)) = -Q(x_-(\eta)) = -\eta^2$ (well-defined by monotonicity of Q on $\mathbb{R}^-$, $\mathbb{R}^+$). Next

$$N(\omega) = N(\varepsilon) = \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi}\Phi(0)\right] = \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} dy\right].$$

At last

$$s_j = s(\eta_j) = \exp\left(\frac{\theta_+(\eta_j)}{\varepsilon}\right)$$

where

$$\theta_+(\eta) = \eta x_+(\eta) + \int_{x_+(\eta)}^\infty \eta - \left(\eta^2 - Q(y)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy$$

and s_j is the normalized coefficient of the Jost solution :

$$\phi_j(x) \sim s_j \exp\left(-\frac{\eta_j x}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Hence it is sufficient to prove that

$$\eta_N \geq \frac{a}{\omega^b}$$

(for more simplicity we call by a different constants). There is from hypothesis for x large enough

$$\frac{1}{a}\frac{1}{|x|^{k_1}} \leq Q(x) \leq \frac{a}{|x|^{k_2}},$$

(with $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq 4$) and since $\eta_N \to 0$ when $\omega \to \infty$, then

$$\frac{1}{a}\frac{1}{x_+(\eta_N)^{k_1}} \leq Q(\eta_N) = \eta_N^2 \leq \frac{a}{(x_+(\eta_N))^{k_2}},$$

and

$$\frac{1}{a}\frac{1}{{\eta_N}^{\frac{2}{k_1}}} \leq x_+(\eta_N) \leq \frac{a}{{\eta_N}^{\frac{2}{k_2}}}$$

(as well as $x_-(\eta_N) = -x_+(\eta_N)$). Thus

$$\Phi(0)-\Phi(\eta_N) = \left(\int_{-\infty}^{x_-(\eta_N)} + \int_{x_+(\eta_N)}^{\infty}\right)(Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}dy + \int_{x_-(\eta_N)}^{x_+(\eta_N)}(Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left(Q(y)-\eta_N^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}dy.$$

First one has

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{x_+(\eta_N)}^{\infty}(Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}dy &\leq \int_{x_+(\eta_N)}^{\infty}\frac{a}{y^{\frac{k_2}{2}}}dy = \frac{a}{{x_+(\eta_N)}^{\frac{k_2-2}{2}}},\\ &\leq a\,{\eta_N}^{\frac{k_2-2}{k_1}}\end{aligned}$$

as well as $\int_{-\infty}^{x_-(\eta_N)}(Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}}dy$. Next

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{x_-(\eta_N)}^{x_+(\eta_N)}(Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left(Q(y)-\eta_N^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}dy &\leq \int_{x_-(\eta_N)}^{x_+(\eta_N)}\left(Q(y)-\left(Q(y)-\eta_N^2\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}dy\\ &= \eta_N(x_+(\eta_N)-x_-(\eta_N)) = a\,{\eta_N}^{1-\frac{2}{k_2}}\\ &\leq a\,{\eta_N}^{\frac{k_2-2}{k_1}}\end{aligned}$$

(because $k_1 \geq k_2$ and $\eta_N < 1$ for ω large enough), thus

$$\Phi(0)-\Phi(\eta_N) \leq a\,{\eta_N}^{\frac{k_2-2}{k_1}}.$$

Since $N = \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon\pi}\Phi(0)\right] \leq \frac{\Phi(0)}{\varepsilon\pi}$ there is

$$\Phi(0)-\Phi(\eta_N) \geq \frac{\varepsilon\pi}{2},$$

it follows that

$$a{\eta_N}^{\frac{k_2-2}{k_1}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon\pi}{2},$$

then

$$\eta_N \geq a\varepsilon^{\frac{k_1}{k_2-2}} = \frac{a}{\omega^{\frac{k_1}{k_2-2}}},$$

which completes the proof of the lemma.

$\surd$

In the following we need a formula of C_j (see [2]). We extend the equation

$$-y'' - \omega^2 Qy = k^2 y$$

with respect to k in the half-plane $\{\Im m\, k > 0\}$. We know that there are the solutions $\phi(k,\cdot)$, $\psi(k,\cdot)$ and $f(k,\cdot)$ which respectively fulfill

$$\begin{cases} \phi(k,\cdot) \in L^2([0,\infty[), \text{ and } \int_0^\infty |\phi(k,x)|^2 dx = 1 \\ \psi(k,0) = 0 \text{ and } \psi'(k,0) = 1 \\ f(k,x) \sim \exp(ikx),\ x \to \infty\,. \end{cases}$$

$\phi(k,\cdot)$ is the physical solution and $f(k,\cdot)$ is called the Jost solution. When k is one of the eigenvalues ξ_j (and only in this case) these three solutions are proportional (and can be chosen to be real) and there is

$$\begin{cases} f(k_j,\cdot) = f'(k_j,0)\psi(k_j,\cdot), \\ \phi(k_j,\cdot) = C_j^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi(k_j,\cdot), \\ \phi(k_j,\cdot) = s_j f(k_j,\cdot) \end{cases}$$

(the solutions $\phi(k,\cdot)$ and $f(k,\cdot)$ are always proportional since $\Im m\, k > 0$), then

$$f'(k_j,0) = \frac{C_j^{\frac{1}{2}}}{s_j}\,.$$

In addition we define the Jost function F as $F(k) = f(k,0)$. From above we know that its zeros are exactly the eigenvalues (as we will see F is holomorphic on the half-plane and its zeros are simple). Now we claim that

$$\frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j} = -s_j^2 \left(\dot{F}(i\xi_j)\right)^2 .$$

Indeed by differentiating with respect to k the equation

$$-f''(k,x) - \omega^2 Q(x) f(k,x) = k^2 f(k,x),$$

the derivative (with respect to x) of the wronskian of $f(k,\cdot)$ and $\dot{f}(k,\cdot) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial k}(k,\cdot)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} W'\left(f,\dot{f}\right) &= \left(f(k,x)\dot{f}'(k,x) - f'(k,x)\dot{f}(k,x)\right)' \\ &= f(k,x)\dot{f}''(k,x) - f''(k,x)\dot{f}(k,x) \\ &= -2kf^2(k,x), \end{aligned}$$

which gives when $k = k_j$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F}(k_j)f'(k_j,0) &= -2k_j \int_0^\infty f^2(k_j,x)dx = -\frac{2k_j}{s_j^2}, \\ &= \dot{F}(k_j)\frac{C_j^{\frac{1}{2}}}{s_j}, \end{aligned}$$

this proves the assertion.

We see in addition (since $0 < \eta_N < \ldots < \eta_1 \leq \sqrt{Q(0)}$) that $0 \leq x_+(\eta_1) \leq \ldots \leq x_+(\eta_N)$ and for all $j = 1,\ldots,N(\omega)$,

$$\theta_+(\eta_j) \leq x_+(\eta_N) + \int_0^\infty (Q(y))^{\frac{1}{2}} dy$$

which gives from lemma 3.1

$$\theta_+(\eta_j) \leq a\,\omega^{\frac{2k_1}{k_2(k_2-2)}},$$

then

$$s_j \leq \exp\left(a\omega^{1+\frac{2k_1}{k_2(k_2-2)}}\right).$$

Since $s_j \geq 1$ it is enough to estimate $\left|\dot{F}(i\xi_j)\right|$ hence the proof of the proposition is complete thanks to the following lemma.

$\surd$

Lemma 3.2. *For all* $j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega)$

$$\frac{1}{a\exp(b\omega^2)} \leq \left|\dot{F}(i\xi_j)\right| \leq a\exp\left(b\omega^2\right).$$

Proof. First let consider the equation

$$y'' - Vy = -k^2 y$$

where $x \geq 0$, $V(x) = -\omega^2 Q(x)$ and $\Im m\, k \geq 0$. The Jost solution can be constructed by successive approximations by setting

$$\begin{cases} f_0(k,x) = e^{ikx}, \\ f_n(k,x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{\sin k(x-t)}{k} V(t) f_{n-1}(t)dt\,,\ n \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

which gives

$$f(k,\cdot) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n(k,\cdot),$$

and $F(k) = f(k,0)$ for the Jost function. We know (see [2]) that F is holomorphic on the half-plane $\{\Im m\, k > 0\}$, continue on $\{\Im m\, k \geq 0\}$, vanishes exactly on the eigenvalues $i\xi_j$ and converges to 1 at infinity. Moreover there is the following estimate : $\forall\, x,\ k$,

$$|f_n(k,x)| \leq \exp(-\Im m\, kx)\,\frac{1}{n!}\left(\int_x^\infty \frac{2\sqrt{2}\,t}{1+|k|t}|V(t)|dt\right)^n,$$

then for all k

$$\begin{aligned} |F(k)| \leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |f(k,x)| &\leq \exp\left(2\sqrt{2}\,\omega^2 \int_0^\infty t|Q(t)|dt\right) \\ &= \exp\left(a\omega^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

For all $i\xi_j$ one has by the Cauchy formula on a small disc $D(i\xi_j,\varepsilon)$ which is contained on the domain of holomorphy of F,

$$\left|\dot{F}(i\xi_j)\right| = \left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{|k-i\xi_j|=\varepsilon} \frac{F(k)}{\left(k-i\xi_j\right)^2}dk\right| \leq \frac{\|F\|_\infty}{\varepsilon}.$$

One can choose $\varepsilon = \frac{\xi_1}{2}$ with $\xi_1 = \omega\eta_N$ being the smallest eigenvalue (which is $\geq \frac{b}{\omega}$ by lemma 3.1), then for all $j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega)$

$$\left|\dot{F}(i\xi_j)\right| \leq b\omega^c \exp\left(a\omega^2\right) \leq b' \exp\left(a'\omega^2\right)$$

and this proves the upper estimate.

For the lower estimate we set

$$\widetilde{F}(k) = \frac{F(k)}{\prod_{l=1}^{N} \frac{k-i\xi_l}{k+i\xi_l}} \,,$$

which is as well continue on the closed half-plane, holomorphic inside, converges to 1 at infinity and does not vanish. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{F}(i\xi_j) &= \frac{d}{dk}\left(\prod_{l=1}^{N} \frac{k-i\xi_l}{k+i\xi_l}\right)(i\xi_j)\, \widetilde{F}(i\xi_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{2i\xi_j}\left(\prod_{l\neq j} \frac{\xi_j-\xi_l}{\xi_j+\xi_l}\right) \widetilde{F}(i\xi_j). \end{aligned}$$

First we know that $\xi_j \leq \xi_N \leq b\omega$. Next in order to get a lower estimate of $|\xi_j - \xi_l|$ (we could think that the distribution of the eigenvalues is asymptotically uniform), it is enough to show that

$$\forall\, j,\, l \text{ with } 1 \leq j < l \leq N,\ \eta_j - \eta_l \geq \frac{a}{\omega^b} \,.$$

Indeed one has

$$\eta_j - \eta_l \geq \min_{1\leq l\leq N-1} (\eta_l - \eta_{l+1})$$

and

$$\frac{\pi}{\omega} = \Phi(\eta_{l+1}) - \Phi(\eta_l) = \int_{x_-(\eta_{l+1})}^{x_+(\eta_{l+1})} \left(Q(y) - \eta_{l+1}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy - \int_{x_-(\eta_l)}^{x_+(\eta_l)} \left(Q(y) - \eta_l^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dy.$$

On $[x_+(\eta_l), x_+(\eta_{l+1})]$ (resp. $[x_-(\eta_{l+1}), x_-(\eta_l)]$) there is $\eta_{l+1}^2 \leq Q(y) \leq \eta_l^2$ then

$$Q(y) - \eta_{l+1}^2 \leq \eta_l^2 - \eta_{l+1}^2,$$

and on $[x_-(\eta_l), x_+(\eta_l)]$

$$\left(Q(y) - \eta_{l+1}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \left(Q(y) - \eta_l^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\eta_l^2 - \eta_{l+1}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ,$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\pi}{\omega} &\leq (\eta_l - \eta_{l+1})^{\frac{1}{2}} (\eta_l + \eta_{l+1})^{\frac{1}{2}} (x_+(\eta_{l+1}) - x_-(\eta_{l+1})) \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\, (\eta_l - \eta_{l+1})^{\frac{1}{2}} (x_+(\eta_{l+1}) - x_-(\eta_{l+1})). \end{aligned}$$

On the other side

$$x_+(\eta_{l+1}) - x_-(\eta_{l+1}) \leq x_+(\eta_N) - x_-(\eta_N) \leq a\, \omega^b$$

then

$$\eta_l - \eta_{l+1} \geq \frac{a}{\omega^{b'}} \,.$$

It follows that (since $N(\omega) = O(\omega)$)

$$\prod_{l\neq j} \left|\frac{\xi_j - \xi_l}{\xi_j + \xi_l}\right| \geq \left(\frac{a}{\omega^{b'}}\right)^{N-1} \geq \frac{a''}{\exp(b''\omega^2)} \,.$$

Now we have to get a lower estimate for $\left|\widetilde{F}(i\xi_j)\right|$. Since $\widetilde{F}$ is holomorphic without zero one has for any R large enough :

$$\frac{1}{4i\xi_j\,\widetilde{F}(i\xi_j)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\left(\int_{-R}^{R} \frac{k}{\widetilde{F}(k)(k-i\xi_j)(k+i\xi_j)^2}dk + \int_0^{\pi} \frac{iR^2e^{2i\theta}}{\widetilde{F}(Re^{i\theta})(Re^{i\theta}-i\xi_j)(Re^{i\theta}+i\xi_j)^2}d\theta\right),$$

which gives by taking limit ($\widetilde{F}(k)\to 1$, $k\to\infty$)

$$\frac{1}{\widetilde{F}(i\xi_j)} = \frac{4i\xi_j}{2\pi i}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{k}{\widetilde{F}(k)(k-i\xi_j)(k+i\xi_j)^2}dk$$

thus

$$\frac{1}{\left|\widetilde{F}(i\xi_j)\right|} \leq b\omega\int_0^{\infty} \frac{k}{|F(k)|\,|k-i\xi_j|\,|k+i\xi_j|^2}dk,$$

since $\forall\, k\in\mathbb{R}$, $\left|\widetilde{F}(k)\right| = |F(k)|$ and $F(-k)=\overline{F(k)}$.

In order to get a lower estimate of $\frac{1}{|F(k)|}$ on $\mathbb{R}^+$ we have to use the wronskian of $f(k,\cdot)$ and $f(-k,\cdot)$ which is constant and equal to $-2ik$ (it can be calculated by taking the limit at infinity since $f'(k,x)\sim ike^{ikx}$). In addition for all $k>0$, it is equal to

$$f(k,0)f'(-k,0)-f(-k,0)f'(k,0) = 2i\Im m\left(F(k)\overline{f'(-k,0)}\right).$$

And by the integral equation of which $f(k,\cdot)$ is solution,

$$f(k,x) = e^{ikx} + \int_x^{\infty}\frac{\sin k(x-t)}{k}V(t)f(k,t)dt,$$

we can deduce by the estimation of the Jost solution from above that $\forall\, k>0$

$$\begin{aligned}|f'(k,0)| &\leq k + \int_0^{\infty}|\cos kt|\,|V(t)|\,|f(k,t)|dt\\ &\leq C\omega^2 + \omega^2\exp\left(a\omega^2\right)\int_0^{\infty}|Q(t)|dt\\ &\leq C'\exp\left(a'\omega^2\right),\end{aligned}$$

as well for $f'(-k,0)=\overline{f'(k,0)}$. Thus

$$2k \leq 2|F(k)|C'\exp\left(a'\omega^2\right)$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{k}{|F(k)|\,|k-i\xi_j|\,|k+i\xi_j|^2}dk &= C'\exp\left(a'\omega^2\right)\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{1}{\left(k^2+\xi_j^2\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}dk\\ &\leq C'\exp\left(a'\omega^2\right)\left(\frac{1}{\xi_j^3}+\int_1^{+\infty}\frac{1}{k^3}dk\right)\\ &\leq C''\omega^b\exp\left(a'\omega^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

At last

$$\frac{1}{\left|\widetilde{F}(i\xi_j)\right|} \leq C''\omega^{b'}\exp\left(a''\omega^2\right) \leq \alpha\exp\left(\beta\omega^2\right)$$

and the proof is complete.

$\surd$

Remark 3.1. The constants $a, b, c, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ which appear in the statement of the proposition only depend on any compact $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}} \ni Q:$ indeed their depend on $Q(0)$, $\int_0^\infty (1+t)\sqrt{Q}(t)dt$ and $a,\ k_1,\ k_2$ (to assume that $\frac{1}{a}\frac{1}{x^{k_1}} \leq Q(x) \leq \frac{a}{x^{k_2}}$). This will be usefull to section 5.

In addition when we assume that $k_1 = k_2 = k$ there is for all $j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega)$,

$$b\,\omega \geq \xi_j \geq \omega \frac{a}{\omega^{\frac{k}{k-2}}} \geq \frac{a}{\omega}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\alpha\ \exp(\beta\omega^2)} \leq \frac{\xi_j^2}{C_j} \leq \alpha\ \exp\left(\beta\omega^2\right)\ .$$

Before ending let consider two different examples.

Example 3.1. *Let be*

$$Q_1(x) = \frac{1}{\left(1+x^2\right)^2}.$$

Q_1 is even and satisfies the conditions of proposition 3.1. By WKB method there is (with $\omega \geq 10$) :

$$N(\omega) = \left[\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right] = [\omega]\,.$$

There is $x_+(\eta) = -x_-(\eta) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\eta} - 1}$ and

$$\frac{\pi^2}{256}\frac{1}{\omega^2} \leq \eta_N \leq \frac{\pi^2}{16}\frac{1}{\omega^2},$$

then $\forall\, n$ with $1 \leq n \leq N$,

$$\frac{\pi^2}{256}\frac{1}{\omega} \leq \xi_n \leq \omega.$$

About the distribution of the eigenvalues one has

$$\xi_n - \xi_{n-1} \geq \frac{1}{5\omega}.$$

At last $\forall\, n$ with $1 \leq n \leq N$,

$$1 \leq s_n \leq \exp\left(\frac{4}{\pi}\omega^2 + \frac{\pi}{2}\omega\right)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\exp\left(2\omega \ln 4\omega\right)} \leq \prod_{j \neq n}\left(\frac{\xi_n - \xi_j}{\xi_n + \xi_j}\right)^2 \leq 1\,;$$

next

$$\left|\dot{F}(i\xi_j)\right| \leq \frac{512}{\pi^2}\omega \exp\left(\pi\sqrt{2}\,\omega^2\right) \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{1}{\left|\widetilde{F}(i\xi_j)\right|} \leq 2^{22}\omega^7 \exp\left(\pi\sqrt{2}\,\omega^2\right),$$

thus

$$\frac{1}{45\,\omega^9 \exp\left(26\,\omega^2\right)} \leq \frac{4\xi_n^2}{C_n} \leq 22\,\omega^2 \exp\left(15\,\omega^2\right)\ .$$

Example 3.2. *Let be*

$$Q_2(x)=\begin{cases}1, & si\ x\in[0,1],\\ 0, & si\ x>1.\end{cases}$$

The associate potential is a special case because it is discontinuous at $x=1$. Then we calculate directly the estimations.

The equation $-y''-\omega^2y=\lambda y$ with $\lambda=-\xi^2$ and $0<\xi<\omega$, has the following eigenfunctions

$$y_\xi(x)=\begin{cases}\sqrt{\frac{2\xi}{1+\xi}}\sin\left(\sqrt{\omega^2-\xi^2}\,x\right), & if\ x\in[0,1],\\ \sqrt{\frac{2\xi}{1+\xi}}\,e^{\xi}\sin\sqrt{\omega^2-\xi^2}\,e^{-\xi x}, & if\ x\geq 1,\end{cases}$$

where ξ satisfies the equation

$$\xi\sin\sqrt{\omega^2-\xi^2}+\sqrt{\omega^2-\xi^2}\cos\sqrt{\omega^2-\xi^2}=0. \quad (\diamond)$$

The solutions $y_\xi\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^+)$ fulfill the conditions at 0 and $+\infty$, and are normed :

$$\int_0^{+\infty}y_\xi^2(x)dx=1.$$

First we know that $\xi=O(\omega)$. And since

$$C_\xi=\left(y_\xi'(0)\right)^2=\frac{2\xi}{1+\xi}\left(\omega^2-\xi^2\right),$$

there is

$$\frac{4\xi^2}{C_\xi}=\frac{2\xi(\xi+1)}{\omega^2-\xi^2}.$$

About the first estimation we find as well $0<\frac{4\xi^2}{C_\xi}\leq 220\,\omega^2$: indeed, if $\omega\geq 10$ and $\varepsilon=\sqrt{\omega^2-\xi^2}\leq\frac{1}{10}$, the equation $(\diamond)$ becomes

$$\sqrt{\omega^2-\varepsilon^2}\sin\varepsilon+\varepsilon\cos\varepsilon\geq 10\,\varepsilon>0.$$

It follows that ε must be $\geq\frac{1}{10}$ then

$$\xi\leq\sqrt{\frac{99}{100}}\,\omega.$$

However the lower estimate of $\frac{4\xi^2}{C_\xi}$ need an analogous estimate for ξ which is in general false since the first eigenvalue ξ_1 cannot be low bounded by $\frac{1}{\omega^k}$ or $\exp(-a\omega^b)$, necessary condition to get $\ln\frac{4\xi^2}{C_\xi}=O(\omega^b)$.

Indeed let fix for example ω_0 large enough and $\equiv\frac{\pi}{2}\pmod{2\pi}$, and consider the equation $(\diamond)$ with respect to (ξ,ω), given by a smooth function g in a neighbourhood of $(0,\omega_0)$. Since $\frac{\partial g}{\partial\xi}(0,\omega_0)=\sin\omega_0=1$ and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial\omega}(0,\omega_0)=-\omega_0$, an application of the implicit functions theorem allows to consider the function $\omega\mapsto\xi(\omega)$ which has in a neighbourhood of ω_0 the following expansion

$$\xi(\omega)=\omega_0(\omega-\omega_0)+O\left((\omega-\omega_0)^2\right).$$

Then we see that for all ω such that $0<\omega-\omega_0\leq\eta(\omega_0)$ with $\eta(\omega_0)$ small enough, one has

$$0<\xi(\omega)\leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\exp\omega\right)$$

and it follows that for any ω large enough we cannot find a lower estimate for ξ as we need. This accident arises from the fact that Q_2 is not continuous at $x = 1$.

However if we set a condition for $\omega \geq 10$ like

$$\left|\omega - \frac{\pi}{2} + \pi\mathbb{Z}\right| \geq \frac{1}{5},$$

we see that for any ξ with $0 < \xi \leq \frac{1}{10}$, we get $\left|\sqrt{\omega^2 - \xi^2} - \frac{\pi}{2} + \pi\mathbb{Z}\right| \geq \frac{1}{10}$ then

$$\left|\xi \sin\sqrt{\omega^2 - \xi^2} + \sqrt{\omega^2 - \xi^2}\cos\sqrt{\omega^2 - \xi^2}\right| \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Hence $\xi \geq \frac{1}{10}$ and

$$\frac{4\xi^2}{C_\xi} \geq \frac{1}{5\omega^2},$$

then we get as well a stronger estimation for $\frac{4\xi^2}{C_\xi}$ as $O(\omega^2)$.

4. SOME PROPERTIES OF THE SOLUTION OF A CERTAIN INTEGRAL EQUATION

Consider for $x,\, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $w \in W = \{\Re e\, z > 0\}$

$$\Phi(x, y, w) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin kx}{k}\frac{\sin ky}{k}\left(\sqrt{k^2 + w} - k\right)\frac{2k}{\pi}\, dk$$

and the integral equation with $(x, y) \in \Delta = \{0 \leq y \leq x\}$ and $w \in W$:

$$A(x, y, w) + \int_0^x A(x, s, w)\Phi(s, y, w) ds + \Phi(x, y, w) = 0\,. \tag{4.1}$$

We want to prove in this section the following result :

Proposition 4.1. *The equation 4.1 has an unique solution $A(x, y, w)$ defined on $\Delta \times W$. It is continuous with respect to (x, y) and holomorphic with respect to w, and the application*

$$x \mapsto \left(y \mapsto A(x, y, w) \in L^2_y([0, x])\right),$$

is continuously differentiable (with respect to the topology of $L^2([0, x])$).

Moreover there are the following estimations : for all $X \geq 1$ and $w \in W$,

$$\sup_{y\leq x\leq X} |A(x, y, w)|,\ \sup_{x\leq X}\left\|\frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x, y, w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,x])},\ \sup_{x\leq X}\left|\frac{d}{dx}A(x, x, w)\right| \leq C(X)(1+|w|)^\alpha\,.$$

(the exponent α does not depend on X)

The proof consists on the following lemmas. We begin by proving these properties about Φ :

Lemma 4.1. *The function Φ is continuous with respect to $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and holomorphic with respect to $w \in W$. For all $X \geq 0$ the application*

$$x \mapsto \Phi(x, y, w) \in L^2_y([0, X])$$

is continuously differentiable and there are the following estimates :

$$\sup_{x,y\in[0,X]} |\Phi(x, y, w)|,\ \sup_{x\leq X}\left\|\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x, y, w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \leq C(X)(1 + |w|)^\alpha.$$

Moreover the restriction

$$x \mapsto \Phi(x, x, w)$$

is continuously differentiable (in the usual sense) and there is the following estimate :

$$\sup_{x \leq X} \left| \frac{d}{dx} \Phi(x, x, w) \right| \leq C(X)(1 + |w|)^{\alpha}.$$

(in all the cases the exponent α does not depend on X)

Proof. First Φ is well-defined since the integral is absolutely convergent :

$$\Phi(x, y, w) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\sin kx}{k} \frac{\sin ky}{k} \frac{w}{k + \sqrt{k^2 + w}} \frac{2k}{\pi} dk,$$

where we have chosen the principal determination of $\sqrt{z}$. Φ is holomorphic with respect to w and for all $X \geq 1$

$$\|\Phi(\cdot, w)\|_{\infty, X} \leq C(X)|w|.$$

Next, we have to prove the differentiability of $x \mapsto \Phi(x, \cdot, w)$:

$$\Phi(x, y, w) = \left(\int_0^1 + \int_1^{\infty} \right) \frac{\sin kx}{k} \frac{\sin ky}{k} \frac{w}{k + \sqrt{k^2 + w}} \frac{2k}{\pi} dk,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \int_0^1 \frac{\sin kx}{k} \frac{\sin ky}{k} \left(\sqrt{k^2 + w} - k \right) \frac{2k}{\pi} dk = \int_0^1 \cos kx \frac{\sin ky}{k} \left(\sqrt{k^2 + w} - k \right) \frac{2k}{\pi} dk,$$

which is continuous with respect to (x, y) in the usual sense (then in the space $L^2_y([0, X])$ too, with polynomial estimation with respect to w).

On the other hand

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\sin kx}{k} \frac{\sin ky}{k} \frac{w}{k + \sqrt{k^2 + w}} \frac{2k}{\pi} dk = \frac{w}{\pi} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\cos k(x - y) - \cos k(x + y)}{k \left(k + \sqrt{k^2 + w} \right)} dk.$$

Now let consider the integral with $\cos k(x - y)$: by integrating by parts we get

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\cos k(x - y)}{k \left(k + \sqrt{k^2 + w} \right)} dk = -\frac{\sin (x - y)}{x - y} \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{1 + w}} + \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\sin k(x - y)}{x - y} \frac{2 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}}}}{k^3 \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}} \right)^2} dk.$$

The first term is clearly continuously differentiable with respect to (x, y) with derivatives of polynomial kind with respect to w. Now assume that $x > y$ and differentiate under the integral to get

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{k(x - y) \cos k(x - y) - \sin k(x - y)}{(x - y)^2} \frac{2 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}}}}{k^3 \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}} \right)^2} dk$$

$$= \left(\int_{x-y}^1 + \int_1^{\infty} \right) \frac{k \cos k - \sin k}{k^3} \frac{2 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(x - y)^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(x - y)^2}}}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(x - y)^2} \right)^2} dk.$$

The first integral is clearly continuous with respect to (x, y) since it is an absolutely convergent integral of a continuous function, and can be extended to $y \leq x$. The second is even an absolutely convergent integral (since $x \leq X$) of a continuous function which can be extended to $y \leq x$. Moreover the derivative is still of polynomial kind with respect to w.

Now if $x < y$ the derivative of the integral is

$$\left(\int_{y-x}^{1} + \int_{1}^{\infty}\right) \frac{k\cos k - \sin k}{k^3} \, \frac{2 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(y-x)^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\frac{w}{k^2}(y-x)^2}}}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(y-x)^2}\right)^2} \, dk,$$

which is continuous with respect to (x, y) with continuous extension on $\{x \leq y\}$ (and of polynomial kind with respect to w).

In the same way the integral with $\cos k(x+y)$ is

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\cos k(x+y)}{k\left(k + \sqrt{k^2+w}\right)} dk = -\frac{\sin(x+y)}{x+y}\,\frac{1}{1+\sqrt{1+w}} + \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\sin k(x+y)}{x+y}\,\frac{2 + \sqrt{1+\frac{w}{k^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\frac{w}{k^2}}}}{k^3\left(1+\sqrt{1+\frac{w}{k^2}}\right)^2} dk,$$

and the derivative of the second integral is

$$\left(\int_{x+y}^{1} + \int_{1}^{\infty}\right) \frac{k\cos k - \sin k}{k^3} \, \frac{2 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(x+y)^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\frac{w}{k^2}(x+y)^2}}}{\left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{w}{k^2}(x+y)^2}\right)^2} dk,$$

which is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$ and of polynomial kind with respect to w.

Notice that $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}$ does not exist on $\{x = y\}$ since the limits from each side are different : indeed

$$\lim_{(x-y)\to 0^+} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) - \lim_{(x-y)\to 0^-} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) = 2\int_0^{\infty} \frac{k\cos k - \sin k}{k^3} dk \neq 0.$$

Nevertheless the application

$$x \mapsto \Phi(x,y,w) \in L^2_y([0,X])$$

is continuously differentiable :

$$\left\| \frac{\Phi(x+h,y,w) - \Phi(x,y,w)}{h} - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right\|^2_{L^2_y([0,X])} =$$

$$= \int_{y\neq x} \left| \frac{\Phi(x+h,y,w) - \Phi(x,y,w)}{h} - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right|^2 dy,$$

and for all $y \neq x$

$$\frac{\Phi(x+h,y,w) - \Phi(x,y,w)}{h} \xrightarrow[h\to 0]{} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w),$$

with domination in $L^2_y([0,X])$ (since $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}$ can be continuously extended on $\{x \geq y\}$ and $\{x \leq y\}$ although the limits do not coincide) then

$$\left\| \frac{\Phi(x+h,y,w) - \Phi(x,y,w)}{h} - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \xrightarrow[h\to 0]{} 0.$$

By the same argument one proves that the derivative is continuous :

$$\int_{y\neq x} \left| \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x+h,y,w) - \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right|^2 dy \xrightarrow[h\to 0]{} 0.$$

At last $\sup_{x\leq X} \left\| \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])}$ is of polynomial kind with respect to w.

Now we have to prove the last assertion : for all $x > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(x,x,w) &= \frac{2w}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty}\frac{\sin^2 kx}{k\left(k+\sqrt{k^2+w}\right)}dk\\ &= \frac{2wx}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty}\frac{\sin^2 k}{k\left(k+\sqrt{k^2+wx^2}\right)}dk\end{aligned}$$

(the equality is still true for $x = 0$). One can differentiate under the integral to get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dx}\Phi(x,x,w) &= \frac{2w}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty}\frac{\sin^2 k}{k\left(k+\sqrt{k^2+wx^2}\right)}dk\\ &\quad -\frac{2w^2x^2}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty}\frac{\sin^2 k}{k\sqrt{k^2+wx^2}\left(k+\sqrt{k^2+wx^2}\right)^2}dk,\end{aligned}$$

which is continuous with respect to $x \geq 0$ and the estimate follows.

$\surd$

Next we prove the existence and uniqueness of the solution A :

Lemma 4.2. *For all $x > 0$ and $w \in W$ the equation 4.1 has an unique solution $A(x,y,w)$ for almost all $y \leq x$. Moreover $A(x,y,w)$ is holomorphic with respect to w as a vector-valued function in $L^2_y([0,x])$.*

Proof. First x and w being fixed, consider the complex Hilbert space $L^2([0,x])$ with the associate inner product

$$< f,g >= \int_0^x \overline{f(s)}g(s)ds\,.$$

The resolution of equation 4.1 is equivalent to research the solutions $h(y) \in L^2([0,x])$ such that

$$\left[(Id + K_{x,w})(h)\right](y) = -\Phi(x,y,w),$$

where $K_{x,w}$ is the integral operator of $L^2([0,x])$: $h \mapsto \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds$ ($K_{x,w}$ is effectively an operator since by lemma 4.1 Φ is continuous).

Next the operator $K_{x,w}$ being defined by Φ (which is continuous with respect to y and holomorphic with respect to w) is compact and holomorphic (in the Banach space of operators $\mathcal{E}_{L^2([0,x])}$ with the associate norm) on the domain W. By the analytic Fredholm theorem (see [10]), either $(Id + K_{x,w})^{-1}$ exists for no $w \in W$, or $(Id + K_{x,w})^{-1}$ exists and is holomorphic on $W \setminus S$, where S is a discret subset of W ; in this case for all $w \in S$ the equation $(Id + K_{x,w})(h) = 0$ has a nonzero solution in $L^2([0,x])$.

The first case is not possible since for w small enough $\Phi(x,\cdot,w)$ is small enough for all $x,y \in [0,X]$ (see the beginning of the proof of lemma 4.1), then $(Id+K_{x,w})^{-1}$ can be constructed by successive approximations. In fact the inverse operator exists for all $w \in W$ since $\ker(Id + K_{x,w}) = \{0\}$. Indeed let be $h \in L^2([0,x])$ such that (for almost all $y \in [0,x]$)

$$h(y) + \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds = 0.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\Re e < h, \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,\cdot,w)ds > &= \Re e \int_0^x \overline{h(y)}dy \int_0^x h(s)ds \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin ks}{k}\frac{\sin ky}{k}\left(\sqrt{k^2+w}-k\right)\frac{2k}{\pi}dk \\ &= \int_0^\infty \Re e\left(\sqrt{k^2+w}-k\right)\frac{2k}{\pi}dk \left|\int_0^x h(y)\frac{\sin ky}{k}dy\right|^2 \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty \left(\sqrt{k^2+\Re e\, w}-k\right)\frac{2k}{\pi}dk\left|\int_0^x h(y)\frac{\sin ky}{k}dy\right|^2 \\ &\geq 0\end{aligned}$$

(the permutation of integrals is possible because $h \in L^2([0,x]) \subset L^1([0,x])$), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \Re e\left(< h, h + \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,\cdot,w)ds >\right) \\ &\geq \int_0^x |h(y)|^2 dy\end{aligned}$$

thus $h = 0$. The operator $(Id + K_{x,w})^{-1}$ exists for all $w \in W$ and is holomorphic on W as an operator-valued of $L^2([0,x])$.

It follows that the equation 4.1 has an unique solution $A(x,\cdot,w) \in L^2([0,x])$ given by

$$A(x,\cdot,w) = (Id + K_{x,w})^{-1}(-\Phi(x,\cdot,w)),$$

equality being considered in the space $L^2([0,x])$ then for almost all $y \in [0,x]$. At last $A(x,\cdot,w)$ is holomorphic as a vector-valued function in $L^2([0,x])$ since $(Id+K_{x,w})^{-1}$ is a holomorphic operator, and $-\Phi(x,y,w)$ is holomorphic on the usual sense then even on the space $L^2([0,x])$.

$\surd$

Before proving the regularity of A we need the following lemmas :

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $x_0 \in [0,X]$ and a neighbourhood V_0 of x_0, and consider the operator $L_{x_0,w} = (Id + K_{x_0,w})^{-1}$. Then for all continuous function $f(x,y)$ on $V_0 \times [0,X]$ such that the application*

$$x \in V_0 \mapsto f(x,y) \in L^2_y([0,X])$$

is continuously differentiable, the image $L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))$ satisfies the same properties as f and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot)) = L_{x_0,w}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,\cdot)\right).$$

Moreover there are the following estimates :

$$\sup_{x\in V_0, y\leq X} |L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot)(y)| \leq \left(1 + x_0\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right)\|f\|_\infty$$

and

$$\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial x}L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \leq \left(1 + X\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty\|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right)\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,\cdot)\right\|_{L^2([0,X])}.$$

Proof. First the element $L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))$ is well-defined, and since $f(x,\cdot) = (Id + K_{x_0,w})(L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))$ (equality in $L^2([0,x_0])$) then for almost all $y \in [0,x_0]$

$$L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y) = f(x,y) - \int_0^{x_0} L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds.$$

The integral does not depend on the choice of the representant of $L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))$ and gives a continuous function with respect to y. Since the right member is still defined for $y \in [0,X]$ it follows that the representant of $L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))$ can be chosen as a continuous function wich can be extended on $[0,X]$ (and the equality will be true for all $y \in [0,X]$).

Since f is continuous with respect to (x,y) the application $x \mapsto f(x,\cdot) \in L^2_y([0,x_0])$ is continuous, so is $L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))$. It follows that the above integral is continuous with respect to $(x,y) \in V_0 \times [0,X]$, as the function $L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y)$, and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality :

$$|L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot)(y)| \leq |f(x,y)| + \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])} \|f(x,s)\|_{L^2_s([0,x_0])} \|\Phi(s,y,w)\|_{L^2_s([0,x_0])},$$

then

$$\|L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot)(y)\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty + \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])} \sqrt{x_0} \|f\|_\infty \sqrt{x_0} \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty,$$

which proves the first estimate.

Next, the application $x \mapsto f(x,\cdot) \in L^2_y([0,X])$ being continuously differentiable and $L_{x_0,w}$ an operator of $L^2([0,x_0])$, it follows that the application

$$x \mapsto L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot)) \in L^2_y([0,x_0])$$

is continuously differentiable too and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot)) = L_{x_0,w}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,\cdot)\right).$$

In order to extend the property on $[0,X]$ one can differentiate (in $L^2_y([0,x_0])$) the above formula to get

$$L_{x_0,w}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,\cdot)\right)(y) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,y) - \int_0^{x_0} L_{x_0,w}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,\cdot)\right)(s)\,\Phi(s,y,w)ds,$$

which is still well-defined if $y \in [0,X]$ and gives a function in $L^2_y([0,X])$ continuous with respect to $x \in V_0$.

At last the second estimate follows since for all $x \in V_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial x} L_{x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \leq\ & \left\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,y)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \\ & + \left\|L_{x_0,w}\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,\cdot)\right)(s)\right\|_{L^2_s([0,x_0])} \|\Phi(s,y,w)\|_{L^2([0,x_0]\times[0,X])} \\ \leq\ & \left\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,y)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \\ & + \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])} \left\|\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s)\right\|_{L^2_s([0,X])} \sqrt{x_0 X} \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

$\surd$

Lemma 4.4. *The assertion is still true if we consider the operator $H_{x,x_0,w}$ defined by*

$$H_{x,x_0,w} : f(x,\cdot) \mapsto \left(y \in [0,X] \mapsto \int_{x_0}^{x} f(x,s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds\right)$$

with derivative

$$x \in V_0 \mapsto f(x,x)\Phi(x,y,w) + \int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds,$$

and the following estimates (take $V_0 = [x_0 - \eta, x_0 + \eta]$ *) :*

$$\sup_{x \in V_0, y \leq X} |H_{x,x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y)| \leq \eta \, \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|f\|_\infty,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in V_0} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_{x,x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y) \right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} &\leq \sqrt{X}\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|f\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\eta}\,\sqrt{X}\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \sup_{x \in V_0} \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s) \right\|_{L^2_s([0,X])}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First the function $H_{x,x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y)$ is clearly continuous on $V_0 \times [0,X]$ and the first estimation follows.

Next we will prove a stronger result : the application $x \mapsto H_{x,x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot) \in C^0_y([0,X])$ is continuously differentiable (i.e. with respect to the uniform topology). Indeed for all $x \in V_0$ and $y \in [0,X]$

$$\left| \frac{\Delta}{\Delta x} \left(\int_{x_0}^{x} f(x,s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds \right) - f(x,x)\Phi(x,y,w) - \int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds \right| \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \left| \frac{1}{h} \int_{x}^{x+h} f(x+h,s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds - f(x,x)\Phi(x,y,w) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{x_0}^{x} \left(\frac{f(x+h,s) - f(x,s)}{h} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s) \right) \Phi(s,y,w)ds \right| \\ &\leq \|f(x+h,s)\Phi(s,y,w) - f(x,x)\Phi(x,y,w)\|_{\infty, s \in [x,x+h]} \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{f(x+h,s) - f(x,s)}{h} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s) \right\|_{L^2_s([0,X])} \|\Phi(s,y,w)\|_{L^2_s([0,X])}, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 uniformly on $y \in [0,X]$ (by uniform continuity of f and Φ, see lemma 4.1). Since the application $x \mapsto \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s) \in L^2_s([0,X])$ is continuous, it follows that the derivative

$$x \in V_0 \mapsto f(x,x)\Phi(x,y) + \int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s)\Phi(s,y)ds \in C^0_y([0,X])$$

is continuous, and the second estimate can be deduced : for all $x \in V_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_{x,x_0,w}(f(x,\cdot))(y) \right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} &\leq \sqrt{X}|f(x,x)| \, \|\Phi(x,\cdot,w)\|_\infty \\ &\quad + \sqrt{X} \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,s) \right\|_{L^2_s([x_0,x])} \sqrt{|x - x_0|}\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

√

Now the regularity of A can be proved :

Lemma 4.5. *The function $A(x,y,w)$ is continuous with respect to $(x,y) \in \Delta$, holomorphic with respect to $w \in W$ (in the usual sense) and such that the application $x \mapsto A(x,y,w) \in L^2_y([0,x])$ is continuously differentiable. Particularly the equation 4.1 is satisfied for all $(x,y) \in \Delta$ and $w \in W$ (and not only for almost $y \leq x$).*

Proof. The regularity being a local property, let fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and a neighbourhood $V_0 = [x_0 - \eta, x_0 + \eta]$. For all $x \in V_0$ and almost y with $0 \leq y \leq x$, the equation 4.1 is equivalent to

$$(Id + K_{x,w})(A(x,\cdot,w))(y) = -\Phi(x,y,w).$$

Writing $K_{x,w} = K_{x_0,w} + (K_{x,w} - K_{x_0,w}) = K_{x_0,w} + H_{x,x_0,w}$ and applying $L_{x_0,w}$ (by lemma 4.2), the equation becomes

$$A(x,y,w) + [L_{x_0,w} \circ H_{x,x_0,w}](A(x,\cdot,w))(y) = L_{x_0,w}(-\Phi(x,\cdot,w))(y).$$

Now we can solve this integral equation by successive approximations by setting for $x \in V_0$:

$$\begin{cases} A_0(x,y,w) = -L_{x_0,w}(\Phi(x,\cdot,w))(y), \\ A_{n+1}(x,y,w) = -[L_{x_0,w} \circ H_{x,x_0,w}](A_n(x,\cdot,w))(y), \ \text{for all } n \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Assume that the function $\tilde{A}(x,y,w) := \sum_{n\geq 0} A_n(x,y,w)$ is well-defined and continuous for all $x - x_0$ small enough with $x \leq X$ and $y \leq X$ (X being fixed) and such that $x \mapsto \tilde{A}(x,y,w) \in L^2_y([0,X])$ is continuously differentiable. Then by uniqueness of the solution of equation 4.1 it will follow that $x \mapsto A(x,y,w) \in L^2_y([0,x])$ is continuously differentiable : for all x_0, $A(x,y,w)$ can be extended on $[x_0 - \eta, x_0 + \eta] \times [0,X]$ by a continuously differentiable function (which can depend on x_0). Moreover the equation 4.1 will be true for all (x,y,w) and A holomorphic in the usual sense (indeed, by using the Cauchy formula in $L^2_y([0,X])$, there is equality for almost all y of continuous functions with respect to y).

First we claim that for all $n \geq 0$, $A_n(x,y,w)$ is continuous on $V_0 \times [0,X]$ and such that the application $x \in V_0 \mapsto A_n(x,y,w) \in L^2_y([0,X])$ is continuously differentiable. This is true for $n = 0$: indeed, by lemma 4.1 these properties are satisfied by Φ, and by lemma 4.3 this is still true for $A_0(x,y,w)$.

Now if the property is true with A_n, by lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 it is still true with $A_{n+1}(x,y,w) = -[L_{x_0,w} \circ H_{x,x_0,w}](A_n(x,\cdot,w))(y)$.

Next, in order to prove that $\widetilde{A}$ is continuous on $V_0 \times [0,X]$ and $x \in V_0 \mapsto A(x,y,w) \in L^2_y([0,X])$ is continuously differentiable, it is sufficient to prove that the following power series

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} \|A_n(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \text{ and } \sum_{n\geq 0} \sup_{x\in V_0} \left\| \frac{\partial A_n}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])}$$

are convergent. For all $n \geq 0$, by lemmas 4.3 and 4.4

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_{n+1}(\cdot,w)\|_\infty &\leq \left(1 + x_0 \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right) \sup_{x\in V_0, y\leq X} |H_{x,x_0,w}(A_n(x,\cdot,w))(y)| \\ &\leq \eta \left(1 + x_0 \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right) \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|A_n(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\|A_n(\cdot,w)\|_\infty}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

for η small enough (and depending on x_0, X, w). It follows that for all $n \geq 0$

$$\|A_n(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|A_0(\cdot,w)\|_\infty}{4^n}$$

and the convergence of the first power serie is proved.

Now by lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, for all $n \geq 2$ and uniformly on $x \in V_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\partial A_{n+1}}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} &\leq \left(1 + X\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right) \left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial x} H_{x,x_0,w}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \\ &\leq \left(1 + X\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right) \sqrt{X}\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \\ &\quad \times \left(\|A_n(\cdot,w)\|_\infty + \sqrt{\eta}\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial A_n}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$C_0(X,x_0,w) = \max\left\{\|A_0(\cdot,w)\|_\infty,\ \sqrt{X}\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \left(1 + X\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \|L_{x_0,w}\|_{L^2([0,x_0])}\right)\right\},$$

assume that $\sqrt{\eta} \leq \frac{1}{4}$ and choose an integer $N_0 = N_0(X, x_0, w)$ such that for all $n \geq N_0$

$$\frac{n+2}{\frac{n+1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}} \geq C_0\,.$$

Let consider a constant $C_1 = C_1(X, x_0, w)$ large enough such that

$$C_1 \geq \max\left\{C_0,\ 2^{N_0}\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial A_{N_0}}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])}\right\}.$$

Then ones proves that for all $n \geq N_0$

$$\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial A_n}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} \leq C_1\frac{n+1}{2^n}\,.$$

By construction it is true for $n = N_0$. Assume that it is true for n then from above (and since $\|A_n(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|A_0(\cdot,w)\|_\infty}{4^n} \leq \frac{C_0}{4^n}$) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial A_{n+1}}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])} &\leq C_0\left(\frac{C_0}{4^n} + \frac{C_1}{4}\frac{n+1}{2^n}\right) \\ &\leq C_0C_1\left(\frac{1}{4^n} + \frac{n+1}{2^{n+2}}\right) \\ &\leq C_1\frac{n+2}{2^{n+1}},\end{aligned}$$

by construction of N_0.

The recurrence is proved and it follows that the power serie

$$\sum_{n\geq 0}\sup_{x\in V_0}\left\|\frac{\partial A_n}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])}$$

is convergent and the proof is complete.

$\surd$

Before proving the estimates of A we need the following lemma which is the continuity of the inverse integral operator :

Lemma 4.6. *For all $x > 0$ and $w \in W$, for all $h \in L^2([0,x])$,*

$$\|h\|_{L^2([0,x])} \leq \left\| h(y) + \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds \right\|_{L^2_y([0,x])} .$$

Proof. First

$$\left\| h(y) + \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds \right\|^2_{L^2_y([0,x])} \geq \int_0^x |h(y)|^2 dy + 2\Re e \int_0^x \overline{h(y)} dy \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds,$$

and it has been proved (see proof of lemma 4.2) that for all $w \in W$,

$$\Re e \int_0^x \overline{h(y)} dy \int_0^x h(s)\Phi(s,y,w)ds \geq 0,$$

the inequality follows.

$\surd$

The proof of proposition 4.1 can be complete thanks to the last lemma :

Lemma 4.7. *The function $A(x,y,w)$ is of poynomial kind with respect to w : for all $X \geq 1$ and $w \in W$,*

$$\sup_{y \leq x \leq X} |A(x,y,w)|, \ \sup_{y \leq x \leq X} \left\| \frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,y,w) \right\|_{L^2_y([0,X])}, \ \sup_{x \leq X} \left| \frac{d}{dx} A(x,x,w) \right| \leq C(X)(1+|w|)^\alpha .$$

(α does not depend on X)

Proof. During the proof we will use the same notation for different constants $C(X)$ and α.

First by definition of A and lemma 4.6

$$\begin{aligned} \|A(x,y,w)\|_{L^2_y([0,x])} &\leq \left\| A(x,y,w) + \int_0^x A(x,s,w)\Phi(s,y,w)ds \right\|_{L^2_y([0,x])} \\ &= \|\Phi(x,y,w)\|_{L^2_y([0,x])} \\ &\leq \sqrt{x}\|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \\ &\leq C(X)(1+|w|)^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality coming from lemma 4.1. It follows that for all $0 \leq y \leq x \leq X$

$$\begin{aligned} |A(x,y,w)| &= \left| \int_0^x A(x,s,w)\Phi(s,y,w)ds + \Phi(x,y,w) \right| \\ &\leq \|A(x,s,w)\|_{L^2_s([0,x])} \|\Phi(s,y,w)\|_{L^2_s([0,x])} + \|\Phi(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\|A(\cdot,w)\|_\infty \leq C(X)(1+|w|)^\alpha,$$

this proves the first estimate.

Next by differentiating the equation 4.1 with respect to x (which is possible by lemma 4.5) we get for all $x \leq X$

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,y,w) + \int_0^x \frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,s,w)\Phi(s,y,w)ds + A(x,x,w)\Phi(x,y,w) + \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w) = 0,$$

thus by lemma 4.6

$$\left\|\frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,x])} \leq \left\|A(x,x,w)\Phi(x,y,w)+\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,x])},$$

and by lemma 4.1

$$\sup_{x\leq X}\left\|\frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,y,w)\right\|_{L^2_y([0,x])} \leq C(X)(1+|w|)^{\alpha}.$$

In order to prove the last estimate, take $y = x$ in the equation 4.1 and differentiate (which is possible since by lemmas 4.1, $\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}$ exist in $L^2_y([0,X])$) to get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dx}A(x,x,w) &+ \int_0^x \frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,s,w)\Phi(s,x,w)ds \\ &+A(x,x,w)\Phi(x,x,w)+\int_0^x A(x,s,w)\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(x,s,w)ds+\frac{d}{dx}\Phi(x,x,w)=0,\end{aligned}$$

since $\Phi(x,s,w) = \Phi(s,x,w)$. It follows that for all $x \leq X$

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{d}{dx}A(x,x,w)\right| \quad \leq \quad & |A(x,x,w)\Phi(x,x,w)| + \left\|\frac{\partial A}{\partial x}(x,s,w)\right\|_{L^2_s([0,x])}\|\Phi(s,x,w)\|_{L^2_s([0,x])} \\ &+\|A(x,s,w)\|_{L^2_s([0,x])}\left\|\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x}(s,x,w)\right\|_{L^2_s([0,x])}+\left|\frac{d}{dx}\Phi(x,x,w)\right|,\end{aligned}$$

thus by lemma 4.1 and from above

$$\sup_{x\leq X}\left|\frac{d}{dx}A(x,x,w)\right| \leq C(X)(1+|w|)^{\alpha}.$$

At last the exponent α does not depend on X since it is true with Φ (see lemma 4.1).

$\surd$

5. Applications in Sturm-Liouville inverse problems

5.1. **Some reminds and motivation of the problem.**

We consider here the equation on the half-axis $\mathbb{R}^+$

$$-y''(x)-\omega^2 Q(x)=\lambda y(x),$$

with the following hypothesis : Q is strictly positive and strictly decreasing, integrable with $m+1$ locally integrable derivatives which are polynomially decreasing at infinity. Then we know that there are $N(\omega)$ (of order ω) eigenvalues $\lambda_j = -\xi_j^2$, with $N(\omega)$ L^2-normed eigenfunctions ϕ_j which satisfy $\phi_j(0) = 0$.

Here we deal with an inverse problem : if for any ω large enough we know the $N(\omega)$ eigenvalues ξ_j and characteristic values

$$C_j = \left(\phi_j'(0)\right)^2,$$

$j = 1,\dots,N(\omega)$, we have to get back the potential $-\omega^2 Q$ on $\mathbb{R}^+$. More generally the aim of inverse theory is to reconstruct Q from informations of its solutions :

we principally deal with the case where these informations are given by the Weyl function defined for $\Im m\, k > 0$ as

$$j(k) = \frac{\varphi'(0,k)}{\varphi(0,k)},$$

with ϕ a L^2-integrable solution (and $\lambda = k^2$). We know that it is a meromorphic function on the half-plane of which the poles are exactly the eigenvalues $i\xi_j$ and the residues are (modulo multiplication by $2i\xi_j$) the characteristic values C_j. Thus we can determine the spectral measure $\sigma(d\tau)$ of the potential $-\omega^2 Q$:

$$\sigma(d\tau) = \begin{cases} \sigma_+(d\tau), \ \tau \geq 0, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{N(\omega)} C_j \delta(\tau + \xi_j^2), \ \tau < 0, \end{cases}$$

where σ_+ is a positive measure with a density function and δ the Dirac measure. Thanks to the works of Gelfand and Levitan we can reconstruct Q.

Here we assume that we only know the parameters ξ_j, C_j and the first derivatives of Q at 0. By the result of G. Henkin and N. Novikova in [5] (theorem 1, p. 21), one can approach Q uniformly on any $[0, X]$, with precision of order

$$\frac{1}{\omega^m},$$

by a function Q_ω arising from the potential $q_\omega(x) = -\omega^2 Q_\omega(x)$ associate to the explicit spectral measure $\sigma_\omega(d\tau)$ constructed with the ξ_j, C_j and $Q^{(s)}(0)$ for $s = 0, \ldots, m$ (see [5]).

For $m = 1$ there is an explicit potential $q_\omega^0 = -\omega^2 Q_\omega^0$ defined by (cf [5], p. 23)

$$Q_\omega^0(x) = \frac{2}{\omega^2} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \ln |\det W_{s,r}(x)|,$$

where

$$W_{s,r}(x) = \frac{2sh(\xi_s + \xi_r)x}{\xi_s + \xi_r} - (1 - \delta_{s,r}) \frac{2sh(\xi_s - \xi_r)x}{\xi_s - \xi_r} - \delta_{s,r} \left(2x - \frac{4\xi_r^2}{C_r} \right),$$

s, $r = 1, \ldots, N(\omega)$. There is uniformly on any $[0, X]$

$$\left| \int_0^x Q(y) dy - \int_0^x Q_\omega^0(x) \right| = O\left(\frac{\ln \omega}{\sqrt{\omega}} \right)$$

(but the precision could be better than $\frac{\ln \omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}$, we think that it should be of order $\frac{1}{\omega^3}$).

It has been conjectured in [5], p. 22 that such a formula with $2N(\omega)$ parameters (the ξ_j and C_j) could not uniformly approach a function in general position with m bounded derivatives (i.e. the compact set Λ_m) better than of order $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$. Otherwise we have a natural question : can we find, or at least prove the existence of a formula which would get a better approximation ?

By assuming that such a formula can be written as an analytic function with respect to the parameters ξ_j, C_j (and $Q^{(s)}(0)$, $s = 0, \ldots, m$), and relating with the negatives results which are given in 2, we are going to give lower bounds for such approximations in order to get the two following results about the best reconstruction of potentials (theorems 5.1 and 5.2).

If p is an integer, $\mathcal{Q}_p$ will mean the class of functions Q which are defined on $\mathbb{R}^+$, strictly positive, strictly decreasing with p locally integrable derivatives which vanish at 0, and with polynomially behavior at infinity as well as its derivatives. The set $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_p}$ will mean any compact set of $\mathcal{Q}_p$ such that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{p\,|[0,1]}}$ is of kind $\Lambda_p([0,1])$ and for any $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_p}$ the parameters $\int_0^\infty (1+t)\sqrt{Q(t)}dt$ and a, k are bounded (where $\frac{1}{a}\frac{1}{1+x^k} \leq Q(x) \leq \frac{a}{1+x^k}$). It follows that the constants which appear to estimate the eigenvalues and the characteristic values of Sturm-Liouville operator, only depend on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_p}$ (see remark 3.1).

5.2. **Result on the case with 2 derivatives.** As application of our negative results on approximation theory (corollary 2.3) and positive results above (see [5]), we will obtain the following theorem :

Theorem 5.1. *Let consider $\mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$, and for any ω large enough and $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$ the Sturm-Liouville operators $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$.*

For any N with $a_1\omega \leq N \leq a_2\omega$, let $\psi(x,\zeta)$ be a function defined on $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{C}^N$, of class C^1 with respect to x and which satisfies the conditions of corollary 2.2 on any $[0,X]$ (with respect to ω). At last let $b(\omega) > 0$ be a constant such that $b(\omega)$ and $\frac{1}{b(\omega)}$ are polynomial at ω.

Then the approximation of

$$\int_0^{\cdot} \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2} := \left\{ \left(x \mapsto \int_0^x Q(t)dt \right),\ Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2} \right\},$$

uniformly on any $[0,X]$ with $X \geq 1$, by the family

$$\left\{ \left(x \mapsto \frac{1}{b(\omega)} \left(\frac{1}{\psi}\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x} \right)(x,\zeta) \right),\ \zeta_j = O(\omega^r),\ \forall\, j = 1,\dots,N \right\}$$

when $\omega \to \infty$, cannot be better than of order of

$$\frac{1}{(\omega \ln \omega)^3}.$$

In addition we have got an approximation formula such that if $N(\omega)$ is the number of eigenvalues ξ_j and characteristic values C_j of the operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$ and

$$\Psi(x,\zeta) = \det \widetilde{W}_{s,r}(x,\zeta)$$

with

$$\widetilde{W}_{s,r}(x,\zeta) = \frac{2sh(\zeta_r+\zeta_s)x}{\zeta_r+\zeta_s} - (1-\delta_{s,r})\frac{2sh(\zeta_s-\zeta_r)x}{\zeta_s-\zeta_r} - \delta_{s,r}\left(2x - \exp\left(\zeta_{r+N(\omega)}\right)\right),$$

s, $r = 1,\dots,N(\omega)$, then the family $\left\{\frac{2}{\omega^2}\frac{1}{\Psi}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x}\right\}$ approximates the compact set $\int_0^{\cdot}\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$ at least with the precision of order $\frac{\ln\omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}$.

Moreover Q being given, such an element $\zeta(Q)$ can be chosen as

$$\zeta_j(Q) = \xi_j(Q) \text{ and } \zeta_{j+N(\omega)}(Q) = \ln\frac{4\xi_j^2(Q)}{C_j(Q)},\ j = 1,\dots,N(\omega).$$

There is no analytic formula which can approximate any given potential (with 2 derivatives) with a better precision than of order $\frac{1}{(\omega\ln\omega)^3}$. The explicit approximating formula given by Gelfand-Levitan-Jost-Kohn gives a positive result with a precision of order (at least) $\frac{\ln\omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}$ (as we already indicated we think that it should be of order $\frac{1}{\omega^3}$). We know the negative result for a polynomial family (see [11], [12], [7]), so it is natural to wonder what will happen if we consider a nonlinear family with

ω parameters in order to get a better approximation. This negative result gives an answer to the question asked in [5], p. 22.

On the other side it is interesting to see that the explicit formula in the positive result has not been specially constructed in the sense of abstract approximation theory but it comes from mathematical physics.

Proof. First from definition of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$ the restriction on $[0,1]$ of any Q is in (a homothetic of) $\Lambda_2([0,1])$, and conversely let $h \in \Lambda_2([0,1])$ be strictly positive, strictly decreasing with $h'(0) = h''(0) = 0$, it can be extended on $\mathbb{R}^+$ to a function Q_h (then a potential $-\omega^2 Q_h$) such that $Q_h \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$.

One can apply the corollary 2.3 (for $m = 2$) with ψ and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$ since N and ω have same order, and there is a potential $-\omega^2 Q_h,\ Q_h > 0$, such that $\int_0^{\cdot} Q_h$ cannot be closer to $\left\{ \frac{1}{b(\omega)} \frac{1}{\psi} \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}(\cdot, \zeta) \right\}$ on $[0,1]$, than $\frac{C}{(N \ln N)^3}$ for all ζ of polynomial size at ω, thus of order $\frac{1}{(\omega \ln \omega)^3}$ on any $[0,X]$.

Now notice that for any $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$ the choice of $N_Q(\omega)$ is possible to get since there are constants b_1 and b_2 (depending only on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$) such that for all Q

$$b_1 \omega \leq N_Q(\omega) \leq b_2 \omega.$$

Indeed Q being decreasing, there are the bounds of Calogero (see [1], [10]) :

$$\frac{\omega}{\pi \sqrt{Q(0)}} \int_0^{\infty} Q(x) dx - \frac{1}{2} \leq N(\omega) \leq \frac{2\omega}{\pi} \int_0^{\infty} \sqrt{Q(x)} dx$$

with Q in a compact subset.

Next the function Ψ fulfills the conditions of corollary 2.2. Indeed it is a function with $2N(\omega)$ parameters ($N(\omega)$ and ω being of same order) and entire of exponential kind :

it is true with $\frac{sh(\zeta_s \pm \zeta_r)x}{\zeta_s \pm \zeta_r}$ on any $[0,X]$ then as well as $\widetilde{W}_{s,r}$ and each product of the determinant :

$$\left\| \prod_{j=1}^{N(\omega)} \widetilde{W}_{j,\tau(j)} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_1(X)^{N(\omega)} \exp\left(C_2(X) \|\zeta\|_1\right).$$

Since the number of these products is $N(\omega)! = O\left(\exp\left(N(\omega)^2\right)\right)$, one gets an estimate of Ψ as $O\left(\exp\left(\alpha \omega^{\beta}\right)\right)$.

One can deduce the estimates of $\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}$ since Ψ is as well entire (and of exponential kind) with respect to the variable x. The Cauchy formula applied on the disc $D(0, X+1)$ and the above estimation give the same upper estimate about $\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}$ on any $[0,X]$ and for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^{2N(\omega)}$.

On the other side

$$\det\left(\widetilde{W}_{s,r}\right)(0)^{-1} = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{j=1}^{N(\omega)} \exp\left(-\zeta_{N(\omega)+j}\right) \leq \exp(\|\zeta\|_1) = O\left(e^{\alpha \omega^{\beta}}\right).$$

And the choice of the valuations

$$\zeta_j(Q) = \xi_j\left(-\omega^2 Q\right) \text{ and } \zeta_{j+N(\omega)}(Q) = \ln \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\left(-\omega^2 Q\right),\ j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega),$$

is possible to get since $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$ satisfies the conditions of proposition 3 : it follows that $\xi_j\left(-\omega^2 Q\right) = O(\omega)$ and

$$\frac{1}{\alpha \exp(\beta\omega^\gamma)} \leq \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\left(-\omega^2 Q\right) \leq \alpha \exp(\beta\omega^\gamma)$$

then $\ln \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\left(-\omega^2 Q\right) = O\left(\omega^\gamma\right)$ (and notice that by remark 3.1 the constants depend only on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$).

At last this choice of $\zeta(Q)$ gives the effective approximation of all $\int_0^{\cdot} Q$ on any $[0, X]$ with precision of order of $\frac{\ln\omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}$: indeed this is an application of the theorem 2 given in [5] p. 22, which claims that uniformly on any $[0, X]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_0^x Q(y)dy - \frac{1}{\omega^2}\frac{1}{\Psi(x)}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x}(x, \zeta(Q))\right| &= \left|\int_0^x Q(y)dy - \frac{2}{\omega^2}\int_0^x \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\ln\left|\Psi(y, \zeta(Q))\right| dy\right| \\ &= \left|\int_0^x Q(y)dy - 2\int_0^x Q_\omega^0(y)dy\right| \\ &= O\left(\frac{\ln\omega}{\sqrt{\omega}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The conditions of regularity about Q are fulfilled in order to apply the theorem : Q is strictly positive (as well lower bounded by a constant only depending on the compact $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_2}$) and in (a homothetic of) Λ_2 : this condition can replace the bounded number of intervals of monotonicity on $\mathbb{R}^+$ of Q and its derivatives.

$\surd$

5.3. **Result on the case with $m+1$ derivatives.** Now if we consider the case with $\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}$ of potentials with $m+1$ locally integrable derivatives which all vanish at 0, we can give a spectral measure $\sigma_\omega(d\tau)$ close to the one associate to the operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$. It has the following form :

$$\sigma_\omega(d\tau) = \begin{cases}\frac{1}{\pi}\sqrt{\tau + \omega^2 Q(0)}, \ \tau \geq 0, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{N(\omega)} C_j \delta(\tau + \xi_j^2), \ \tau < 0.\end{cases}$$

Let be for $(x, y) \in \Delta = \{0 \leq y \leq x\}$

$$\Phi(x, y) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{\sin(x\sqrt{\tau})}{\sqrt{\tau}}\frac{\sin(y\sqrt{\tau})}{\sqrt{\tau}}\frac{\omega^2 Q(0)\ d\tau}{\sqrt{\tau + \omega^2 Q(0)} + \sqrt{\tau}},$$

(absolutely convergent integral for all x, y) and consider the kernel $A(x, y)$ solution of the integral equation

$$A(x, y) + \int_0^x A(x, s)\Phi(s, y)ds + \Phi(x, y) \equiv 0.$$

At last let q_ω be the following potential :

$$q_\omega(x) = 2\frac{d}{dx}A(x, x) - 2\frac{d^2}{dx^2}\ln\left|\det T(x)\right|,$$

where $T(x)$ is the matrix of order $N(\omega)$ (see [9]) :

$$\begin{aligned}T_{j,k}(x) = {} & \frac{4\xi_j^2}{C_j}\delta_{j,k} + \\ & + 4\int_0^x \left(sh(\xi_j t) + \int_0^t A(t, s)sh(\xi_j s)ds\right)\left(sh(\xi_k t) + \int_0^t A(t, s)sh(\xi_k s)ds\right) dt.\end{aligned}$$

Then ([5], théorème 1 p. 21) the function $Q_\omega = -\frac{q_\omega}{\omega^2}$ approximates all Q uniformly on any $[0,X]$ with precision of order (at least) of $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$ (and the precision should as well be better, of order of $\frac{1}{\omega^{m+1}}$).

As we see, Q_ω can be written as an analytic function $\widetilde{Q}_\omega(\zeta, w)$ with $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}^{2N}$ and $w \in W = \{\Re e\, z > 0\}$ (w replaces the variable $\omega^2 Q(0)$). More precisely

$$\widetilde{Q}_\omega(x,\zeta,w) = \frac{2}{\omega^2}\left(-\frac{\partial \widetilde{A}}{\partial x}(x,x,w) + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\ln\left|\det \widetilde{T}(x,\zeta,w)\right|\right),$$

where $\widetilde{A}$ is the solution, defined for all $0 \le y \le x$ and $\Re e\, w > 0$, of the equation

$$\widetilde{A}(x,y,w) + \int_0^x \widetilde{A}(x,s,w)\widetilde{\Phi}(s,y,w)ds + \widetilde{\Phi}(x,y,w) = 0$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\Phi}(x,y,w) &= \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{\sin(x\sqrt{\tau})}{\sqrt{\tau}}\frac{\sin(y\sqrt{\tau})}{\sqrt{\tau}}\frac{w\,d\tau}{\sqrt{\tau+w}+\sqrt{\tau}} \\ &= \int_0^\infty \frac{\sin kx}{k}\frac{\sin ky}{k}\frac{w}{k+\sqrt{k^2+w}}\frac{2k}{\pi}dk\end{aligned}$$

($\widetilde{\Phi}$ is well defined since $\Re e\, w > 0$) and

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{T}_{j,k}(x,w,\zeta) &= \exp(\zeta_{N+j})\delta_{j,k} \\ &+ 4\int_0^x \left(sh(\zeta_j t) + \int_0^t \widetilde{A}(t,s,w)sh(\zeta_j s)ds\right)\left(sh(\zeta_k t) + \int_0^t \widetilde{A}(t,s,w)sh(\zeta_k s)ds\right)dt.\end{aligned}$$

Now there is the following theorem :

Theorem 5.2. *Consider in the same way* $\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}$, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ *and the Sturm-Liouville operators* $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$ *with* $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ *and* ω *large enough.*

For any (N,M) *with* $a_1\omega \le N+M \le a_2\omega$, *let* $\psi(x,\zeta,w)$ *(resp.* $k(x,\zeta,w)$ *) be a function defined on* $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^N \times W^M$ *of class* C^2 *(resp. continuous) with respect to* x *and which which satisfies the conditions of corollary 2.1 on any* $[0,X]$ *with* $\Omega_\omega = \Omega_{N,M}$. *At last let* $b(\omega) > 0$ *be a constant such that* $b(\omega)$ *and* $\frac{1}{b(\omega)}$ *are polynomial at* ω.

Then the approximation of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ *uniformly on any* $[0,X]$ *by the family*

$$\left\{\left(x \mapsto \frac{1}{b(\omega)}\left(k(x,\zeta,w) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{1}{\psi}\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}\right)(x,\zeta,w)\right)\right),\ (\zeta,w) \in \Omega_\omega\right\},$$

when $\omega \to \infty$, *cannot be better than of order of*

$$\frac{1}{(\omega \ln \omega)^{m+1}}.$$

In addition there is an almost optimal approximation formula such that, if $N(\omega)$ *is the number of eigenvalues* ξ_j *and characteristic values* C_j *of the operator* $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \omega^2 Q$ *(and* $M=1$*) and* $\left(\widetilde{k}, \widetilde{\Psi}\right)$ *is defined on* $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^{2N(\omega)} \times W$ *as*

$$\widetilde{k}(x,w) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\widetilde{A}(x,x,w) \text{ and } \widetilde{\Psi}(x,\zeta,w) = \det \widetilde{T}_{j,k}(x,\zeta,w)$$

with $\widetilde{A}$ *and* $\widetilde{T}_{j,k}$ *defined as above, then the family*

$$\left\{\frac{2}{\omega^2}\left(\widetilde{k}(x,w)+\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{1}{\widetilde{\Psi}}\frac{\partial\widetilde{\Psi}}{\partial x}\right)(x,\zeta,w)\right)\right\}$$

approximates $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ *at least with the precision of order of*

$$\frac{1}{\omega^m}.$$

Moreover $Q\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ *being given, such an element* $(\zeta(Q),w(Q))$ *can be chosen as*

$$\zeta_j(Q)=\xi_j(Q),\ \zeta_{j+N(\omega)}(Q)=\ln\frac{4\xi_j^2(Q)}{C_j(Q)},\ j=1,\dots,N(\omega),\ \textit{and}\ \ w(Q)=\omega^2Q(0).$$

Proof. The negative result follows on $[0,1]$ by corollary 2.3 since $N+M$ and ω have same order. Moreover the restriction on $[0,1]$ of any potential gives a function in Λ_{m+1} ; conversely any function $h\in\Lambda_{m+1}([0,1])$, strictly decreasing and satisfying $h'(0)=\cdots=h^{(m+1)}(0)=0$, can be extended on $\mathbb{R}^+$ by $Q_h\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$. This proves the negative part with the compact $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$.

On the other hand the positive result with approximation at order of $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$ comes from the theorem 1 of [5] (notice that the condition $Q\in\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ can replace the bounded number of intervals of monotonicity of Q and its derivatives). Then the only difficulty is to prove that the choice of $\left(\widetilde{A},\widetilde{\Psi}\right)$ is possible to get.

First by proposition 4.1 the function

$$x\mapsto\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\widetilde{A}(x,x,w)$$

exists, is continuous with respect to x and holomorphic of polynomial kind with respect to $w\in W$.

Next each function $\widetilde{T}_{j,k}$ is of class C^2 with respect to x : indeed $\widetilde{A}(x,y,w)$ is continuous with respect to $(x,y)\in\Delta$ then

$$\frac{\partial\widetilde{T}_{j,k}}{\partial x}(x,\zeta,w)=4\left(sh(\zeta_jx)+\int_0^x\widetilde{A}(x,s,w)sh(\zeta_js)ds\right)\left(sh(\zeta_kx)+\int_0^x\widetilde{A}(x,s,w)sh(\zeta_ks)ds\right).$$

Since the application $x\mapsto\widetilde{A}(x,y,w)\in L^2_y([0,x])$ is continuously differentiable, it follows that for all j, k

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2\widetilde{T}_{j,k}}{\partial x^2}(x,\zeta,w)\ &=\ 4\left(\zeta_jch(\zeta_jx)+\widetilde{A}(x,x,w)sh(\zeta_jx)+\int_0^x\frac{\partial\widetilde{A}}{\partial x}(x,s,w)sh(\zeta_js)ds\right)\\&\qquad\times\left(sh(\zeta_kx)+\int_0^x\widetilde{A}(x,s,w)sh(\zeta_ks)ds\right)\\&\quad+\ 4\left(sh(\zeta_jx)+\int_0^x\widetilde{A}(x,s,w)sh(\zeta_js)ds\right)\\&\qquad\times\left(\zeta_jch(\zeta_kx)+\widetilde{A}(x,x,w)sh(\zeta_kx)+\int_0^x\frac{\partial\widetilde{A}}{\partial x}(x,s,w)sh(\zeta_ks)ds\right)\end{aligned}$$

exists and is continuous with respect to $x\in\mathbb{R}^+$. Then $\widetilde{\Psi}$ is of class C^2 with respect to x and the estimates are fulfilled : indeed it is true for each $\widetilde{T}_{j,k}$ and its two derivatives thanks to proposition 4.1 hence it is true for the determinant $\widetilde{\Psi}$ and its derivatives.

On the other hand $\widetilde{k}$ is continuous with respect to x and holomorphic of polynomial kind with respect to all $w \in W$ (and not only in $\mathbb{R}^+$).

Moreover for all j, k and all $(\zeta, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{2N(\omega)} \times W$

$$\widetilde{T}_{j,k}(0, \zeta, w) = \exp\left(\zeta_{j+N(\omega)}\right) \delta_{j,k},$$

then for all $(\zeta, w) \in \Omega_\omega$

$$\frac{1}{\Psi(0, \zeta, w)} = O\left(\exp\left(\alpha\omega^\beta\right)\right),$$

and for all $(\zeta, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{2N(\omega)} \times W$, $\frac{\partial \widetilde{T}_{j,k}}{\partial x}(0, \zeta, w) = 0$ thus

$$\frac{\partial \widetilde{\Psi}}{\partial x}(0, \zeta, w) = 0.$$

At last $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ being given, the following choice of parameters

$$\zeta_j(Q) = \xi_j(Q),\ \zeta_{j+N(\omega)}(Q) = \ln \frac{4\xi_j^2(Q)}{C_j(Q)},\ j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega), \text{ and } w(Q) = \omega^2 Q(0),$$

is possible to get : indeed by proposition 3.1 for all $j = 1, \ldots, N(\omega)$

$$\xi_j(Q) \text{ and } \ln \frac{4\xi_j^2(Q)}{C_j(Q)} = O(\omega^\alpha);$$

on the other hand, since $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ is a compact subset there are c_1 and c_2 such that for all $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$,

$$c_1 \leq Q(0) \leq c_2.$$

After choosing $r_2 = 2$ and setting $a_1 = a = B_2(N(\omega) + 1)^2$, we have to find B_2 and ε (depending on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$) such that for all $Q \in \Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ and $\omega \geq \omega_0$ (ω_0 depending on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{Q}_{m+1}}$ too),

$$\left[c_1\omega^2, c_2\omega^2\right] \subset \left[\varepsilon B_2(N(\omega) + 1)^2, (2 - \varepsilon)B_2(N(\omega) + 1)^2\right].$$

Since $\varepsilon < 1$ it is sufficient to get

$$\begin{cases} B_2 \geq \frac{c_2\omega^2}{(N(\omega)+1)^2} \\ \varepsilon \leq \frac{c_1\omega^2}{B_2(N(\omega)+1)^2}. \end{cases}$$

As it was seen in the proof of theorem 5.1, by the bounds of Calogero the number $N_Q(\omega)$ is bounded as

$$b_1\omega \leq N_Q(\omega) \leq b_2\omega,$$

then one can choose B_2 and ε in order to satisfy these inequalities and the proof is finished.

$\surd$

Remark 5.1. When Q vanishes at 0 with derivatives the spectral measure $\sigma_\omega(d\tau)$ becomes

$$\sigma_\omega^0(d\tau) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi}\sqrt{\tau},\ \tau \geq 0, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{N(\omega)} C_j \delta(\tau + \xi_j^2),\ \tau < 0, \end{cases}$$

which gives the Gelfand-Levitan approximating formula Q_ω^0 which is entirely explicit. The one obstacle is that we do not know if the precision of approximation will still be of order of $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$, because in order to apply the theorem 1 in [5], the function Q must be strictly positive on $\mathbb{R}^+$ (in particular at 0). However numerical experiments make think that the approximation at order of $\frac{1}{\omega^m}$ is valid in this case although (see [5], section 4).

5.4. **Another possible application in inverse problem.** Before finishing we give here an example of inverse problem in which we would like to use our negative results.

Example 5.1. *The theorem 1.2 p. 260 in* [8] *gives an original result in the case of* L^2*-approximation : if* u *is a negative potential of class* C^1 *then* $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} u(\cdot,\varepsilon) = u$ *where*

$$u(x,\varepsilon) = -2\varepsilon^2 \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \ln\det(I + G(x,\varepsilon)),$$

with

$$G(x,\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \left(\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{\eta_j+\eta_k}{\varepsilon} x\right)}{\eta_j + \eta_k} C_j C_k \right)$$

and $1 \le j,\ k \le N(\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\omega}$. *Here we as well consider an analytic function with respect to its eigenvalues* η_j *and characteristic values* $\ln C_j$ *of exponential kind. More precisely it has the following form :*

$$\widetilde{G}(x,\zeta,w) = \varepsilon \frac{\exp(w_j + w_k)x}{w_j + w_k} \exp(\zeta_j + \zeta_k),$$

and one can choose $w_j = \frac{\eta_j}{\varepsilon^r}$, $\zeta_k = \ln C_k j = 1,\dots,N(\varepsilon)$, *with* r *large enough such that* $\frac{\eta_j}{\varepsilon^r}$ *can have a positive lower estimate. We hope to get a result like theorems 5.1 and 5.2.*

REFERENCES

[1] F. Calogero, *Upper and lower limits for the number of bound states in a given central potential*, Comm. Math. Phys. **1** (1965), 80–88.

[2] K. Chadan, P. C. Sabatier, *Inverse problems in quantum scattering theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

[3] M. V. Fedoryuk, *Asymptotic methods for linear ordinary differential equations*, Nauka, Moscow, 1983 (Russian) ; traduction française in Editions MIR, Moscow, 1987.

[4] I. M. Gelfand, B. M. Levitan, *On the determination of a differential equation from its spectral function*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Math. **15** (1951), 309–360 ; English transl. in Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. (2) **1** (1955).

[5] G. M. Henkin, N. N. Novikova, *The reconstruction of the attracting potential in the Sturm-Liouville equation through characteristics of negative discrete spectrum*, Stud. Appl. Math., **97** (1996), no. 1, 17–52.

[6] G. M. Henkin, N. N. Novikova, *An application of the theory of the Sturm-Liouville inverse problems to the inverse problems of seismology*, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu, prépublication 273, novembre 2000.

[7] A. Irigoyen, *Résultat négatif en théorie d'approximation de compacts fonctionnels par des variétés analytiques et application à un problème inverse*, arxiv.org/abs/math.FA/0601730

[8] P. D. Lax, C. D. Levermore, *The small dispersion limit of the Korteweg-de Vries equation*, I–III, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **36**:253–290, 571–593, 809–830 (1983).

[9] B. M. Levitan, *Inverse Sturm-Liouville problems*, Nauka, Moscow, 1984 (English transl. VNU Science Press, Vetrecht, 1987).

[10] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics, I–IV. Analysis of operators*, Academic Press, New York-San Francisco-London, 1978.

[11] A. G. Vitushkin, *Estimation of the complexity of the tabulation problem* (Russian), Izdat. Fiz.-Mat. Lit., Moscow, 1959 ; English transl., *Theory of the transmission and processing of information*, Pergamon Press, New York-Oxford-London-Paris, 1961.

[12] H. E. Warren, *Lower bounds for approximation by nonlinear manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (1968), 167–178.

Université Paris VI - Pierre et Marie Curie, UMR 7586, 175, rue du Chevaleret 75013 Paris

E-mail address: `amadeo@math.jussieu.fr`